FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 238

11 December 1985

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Weinberger Remarks Sabotage Summit Accords [PRAVDA 11 Dec] AA 1
Bogachev on Need to Extend 'Common Ground' AA 3
NATO Military Plans, Buildup Threaten Security [Proskurin in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Dec] AA 4

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

PRAVDA Review of Week's International Events [Kharlanov, 8 Dec] CC 1
PRAVDA Editorial Commemorates Human Rights Day [10 Dec] CC 5

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Further on ASTEC Discussions in Moscow A 1
Plenary Session Opens A 1
Baldrige Reads Reagan Message A 1
Deputy Trade Minister's Remarks A 2
U.S. Ambassador's Comments A 2
Komarov on Trade Development A 2
Demichev Receives U.S. Mayor A 3
Murakhovskiy Meets U.S. Executives A 3
Ryzhkov Addresses Officials A 3
Gorbachev Receives Baldrige A 4
Baldrige on Talks A 5
Gorbachev Dinner Speech A 5
Baldrige Dinner Speech A 10
Reaction to Gorbachev Speech A 11
Shultz, Thatcher Discuss SDI, East-West Ties A 12
U.S.-Soviet Friendship Council Lauds Geneva Summit A 12
Main Aspects, Implications of Summit Reviewed [Burlatskiy, Izyumov, Frenkin in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 11 Dec] A 13
Anthology of Summit-Related Materials Published [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 7 Dec] A 19

CHINA

Tolkunov Describes Developments in Ties With PRC [IZVESTIYA 11 Dec] B 1
Chinese Progress in Socialism, Economics Detailed [Burlatskiy] B 4

NORTHEAST ASIA

IZVESTIYA on U.S.-Japanese Economic Relations C 1
[7 Dec]
Exercises 'Camouflage' Militaristic Preparations C 1
[Popov]
CPSU Agricultural Experts Visit Mongolia C 2
[PRAVDA 4 Dec]

SOUTH ASIA

Kabul Airport Bomb Kills 6, Injures 20 D 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Dec]
South Asian Cooperation Group 'Major Step' D 1
[Kharkov]
'Secessionist' U.S. Policy Against DRA Attacked D 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Olteanu Meets With Gromyko; Visits Air Force Unit F 1
[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 Dec]
Marchuk Discusses S&T Issues With Zhivkov F 2
[IZVESTIYA 5 Dec]
Albania Signs Trade Pacts With Bulgaria, Romania F 2
[IZVESTIYA 8 Dec]

WESTERN EUROPE

Commentators on UK-U.S. Memorandum on SDI G 1
Ponomarev G 1
Bogachev G 2
Alekseyev G 3
Maslennikov G 4
[PRAVDA 10 Dec]
Italian Premier's Reappointment Assessed G 4
[Kamynin in IZVESTIYA 5 Dec]
Danish Folketing Resolution on Nuclear Strike Ban G 6

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

Mashinoeksport Exhibition Opens in Kuwait H 1
Akopov Interviewed on Middle East Ties H 1
[KUNA]
U.S. 'Anti-Libyan' Campaign Criticized H 3

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Gorbachev Cables Dos Santos on Reelection J 1
Shevardnadze, Lesotho's Makhele Sign Accord J 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Brazilian Foreign Minister Continues Moscow Visit K 1
More on Shevardnadze Talks K 1

Meets With Gromyko K 1
Setubal Press Conference K 2
Seen Off by Shevardnadze K 2
IZVESTIYA Report K 3
[11 Dec]
Lomeyko Briefing K 6
Setubal Interview K 6
[IZVESTIYA 7 Dec]

NOTICE

USSR National Affairs sections of the Soviet Union DAILY REPORT are being published in a daily supplement beginning 11 December, until further notice. Consumers will receive in this separate volume the following sections normally carried in the regular issues of the DAILY REPORT:

Political & Social Developments (R)

Economic Developments (S)

Agricultural Affairs (T)

Scientific Affairs (U)

Military Developments (V)

WEINBERGER REMARKS SABOTAGE SUMMIT ACCORDS

PM101700 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[Editorial article: "What Is C. Weinberger Driving at?"]

[Text] A few days ago U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger again made slanderous attacks on the USSR. What was chosen as the occasion this time was the deployment in the Soviet Union, in full accordance with the provisions of the SALT II treaty, of the RS-12m mobile ICBM, which is a modernized version of the RS-12 missile (known in the West by the index number SS-13), which has long existed and is taken into account in the treaty.

What then are the complaints that C. Weinberger is making about the Soviet Union?

First of all, the fact that this Soviet missile is mobile. He claims that the mobility of the Soviet ICBM is a "source of serious concern" to the United States.

However, the SALT II treaty permits mobile ICBM's on the understanding that they must be counted toward the overall total level of strategic arms permitted under the treaty. The treaty even provides for special rules for counting mobile ICBM's which take into account precisely this property of them. Under the protocol to the SALT II treaty, whose period of validity was laid down as extending through 31 December 1981, the sides agreed not to deploy both mobile ICBM's and long-range ground- and sea-launched cruise missiles. The period of validity of the protocol has expired. The United States ignored the pledge envisaged by the SALT II treaty to hold talks with the Soviet Union regarding the facilities covered by the protocol. At the time it did not agree to hold talks on the questions that the protocol envisaged would be subject to joint examination, but began the mass production and then the introduction into combat service (vvod v boyevoy sostav] of long-range ground- and sea-launched cruise missiles, which it had pledged not to deploy under the protocol to the SALT II treaty. Therefore, in deciding its future actions with regard to mobile ICBM's and in response to the U.S. actions, the Soviet Union is entitled to act as it sees fit in order to maintain its defense capability at the requisite level.

The deployment of the RS-12m mobile ICBM is being carried out in the Soviet Union in full accordance with the provisions of the SALT I interim agreement. As the RS-12m missiles are deployed in the Soviet Union an appropriate number of stationary missiles are withdrawn from service [snimayetsya s vooruzheniya] while observing all the necessary procedures, and the Soviet side regularly informs the United States about this at the Standing Consultative Commission (SCC). The Pentagon leader, as the compilers of reports on so-called Soviet "violations" of arms control treaties and agreements have repeatedly attempted to do, is again stating, without any foundation, that the RS-12m missile being deployed in the Soviet Union is not a modernization of an existing missile, but a "totally new missile." Mr C. Weinberger does not bother to offer any proof to corroborate this thesis. If you examine the actual situation, no grounds can be adduced for such a claim. The Soviet Union unswervingly fulfills the pledges it assumed under the SALT II treaty.

As is well known, this treaty permits the modernization of ICBM's within certain limits. It is precisely within these permitted limits that the modernization of the Soviet RS-12 missile was carried out. The Soviet representatives informed the U.S. side in the SCC of this promptly and in detail. They quoted the relevant technical data about this, which clearly show that in terms of its weight characteristics, size, number of stages, and type of fuel -- that is, of all the parameters regulated by the treaty's provisions -- the RS-12m missile falls completely within the framework of modernization envisaged by the treaty.

Both the missile in its original form and the modernized version of it have one warhead. The fact that the missile has become mobile in no way changes its fundamental characteristics and does not give grounds for regarding it in its modernized form as some kind of new type of ICBM, as the U.S. side is attempting to do.

In general on the question of mobile ICBM's, representatives of the U.S. Administration occupy a manifestly inconsistent position that is at variance with their previous statements on this score. During the SALT II talks the United States subscribed to the viewpoint that the mobility of ICBM's contributes directly to the survivability of this part of the strategic "triad" and consequently leads to an increase in strategic stability. Similar remarks were also made on the U.S. side at the SALT talks held in 1981-1983, that is, under the present administration. These statements also correspond to the United States' practical actions at that time. The United States was then gambling on deploying a mobile variant of its new MX ICBM. However, having failed to overcome the technical difficulties in deploying a mobile variant of this missile or for some other reason, the United States decided to deploy it in silos. At the same time it embarked on the development [sozdaniye] -- with a combat deployment [razvertyvaniye v boyevoy sostav] deadline of the end of this decade -- of the new Midgetman missile, for which a mobile basing mode is envisaged. It is impossible not to see that the current attacks on making ICBM's mobile is an opportunist ploy by the Pentagon manifestly designed to attempt to delay or even prevent the deployment of mobile ICBM's in the Soviet Union insofar as such deployment increases the survivability of the Soviet strategic forces and makes them less vulnerable to a first strike against them on the part of the United States.

The statement by Mr Weinberger -- a well-known supporter of a so-called "tough" line toward the Soviet Union and of the continuation of the arms race and an opponent of the SALT II treaty -- adds nothing new to his position, and the U.S. defense secretary's latest anti-Soviet outburst could be disregarded were it not for the timing of this statement. A mere 3 weeks have passed since the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. President met in Geneva and recorded in the joint statement on the results of the meeting the two sides' readiness and intention to move toward the elimination of the threat of nuclear war, the prevention of military advantages for the Soviet Union and the United States over each other, the prevention of an arms race in space, and the termination of the arms race on earth. The need to seek the strengthening of strategic stability and the reduction of nuclear arms was reaffirmed. All this is evidently not to Mr C. Weinberger's liking.

It is well known that the U.S. President, who had set off for the Geneva meeting, was pursued by a letter from C. Weinberger in which he attempted to persuade the President not to take in any circumstances any steps which would ease tension between the USSR and the United States and, in particular, would signify a readiness on both sides to adhere to the provisions of the SALT II treaty. Weinberger is now continuing the same line in an attempt to cast the USSR in an unfavorable light in terms of compliance with this treaty, compromise the Soviet Union's position with respect to arms limitation commitments, and thereby align the administration in general against the achievement of any accords with the Soviet Union on ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in space.

This line aimed at sabotaging what was achieved in Geneva is not in keeping with the U.S. people's interests either. As public opinion polls conducted in the United States show, most Americans advocate that the positive achievements resulting from the Geneva meeting be further developed and that subsequent Soviet-U.S. summit meetings, contacts at other levels, and the talks between Soviet and U.S. delegations in Geneva lead to specific accords promoting the lessening of nuclear confrontation in the world, the lessening of the danger of the outbreak of nuclear war, the prevention of an arms race in space, and the ending of the arms race on earth.

This mood is in tune with the aspirations of the Soviet people and all the world's peoples. The Soviet Union is prepared to do everything incumbent upon it to see that these aspirations of the peoples are translated into concrete measures for detente and the improvement of the international situation. But, for all this to be resolved certain circles in the United States should not follow the path of sabotaging the process initiated at the Geneva meeting. What is now required is to promote the development of positive approaches to disarmament questions and observe existing treaties and agreements.

BOGACHEV ON NEED TO EXTEND 'COMMON GROUND'

LD102143 Moscow TASS international Service in Russian 1615 GMT 10 Dec 85

[To Extend Common Ground in the Sides' Positions on Problems of Peace" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, 10 Dec (TASS) -- Vladimir Bogachev, TASS observer on military affairs, writes:

In striving to get the United States' allies to join in the "star wars" program, the Pentagon is counting not only on making use of their laboratories, scientists, and industrial enterprises for the creation of a wide-ranging antimissile defense system for the United States, but also on gaining the right to site on the territory of third states military installations which would ensure the activity of space strike weapons aimed at targets in socialist countries.

In an interview with the Japanese newspaper YOMIURI, (Thomas Mayer), one of the heads of the U.S. "star wars" program, stated that the Pentagon intends to deploy powerful laser installations on the territory of its allies in order to supply energy to so-called killer satellites which are planned to be located in space over the socialist countries.

The implementation of such plans naturally would have negative diplomatic consequences and dangerous military consequences for the countries which have decided to cooperate in militarizing space. First, in giving its agreement to the setting up of U.S. antimissile defense installations on their territory, any country becomes a participant in the undermining of one of the most important Soviet-U.S. treaties on the limitation of antimissile defense systems. The 1972 ABM Treaty quite unequivocally forbids the signatories to deploy antimissile defense systems or their components outside their national territories. No 'wide' or 'narrow' interpretation can change the essence of this provision. The undermining of the ABM Treaty may mean the collapse of the whole process of limitation and cutting of armaments. Secondly, a country which agrees to set up even components of U.S. antimissile defense on its territory, would willingly or unwillingly become an accomplice of the aggressor in the event "star wars" is unleashed.

The whole world sincerely welcomed the statement by the participants in the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting that their task is to prevent an arms race in space and to stop it on earth. All countries of the world without exception can make their contribution to the achievement of this noble aim through practical deeds. It is now important not to permit the aggravation of differences existing between the countries and their allies on the problems of war and peace and to promote the speediest possible attainment of progress in those spheres where there are points of contact between the positions of the sides, to expand the common parts of the positions of the USSR, the United States, and the countries allied with them, which made possible the summit meeting in Geneva.

NATO MILITARY PLANS, BUILDUP THREATEN SECURITY

PM041809 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Dec 85 Second Edition p 3

[Article by Lieutenant General M. Proskurin: "What Lies Behind the 'Rogers Plan'"]

[Text] "Autumn Forge-85" -- the very large-scale 2-month maneuvers by NATO allied and national armed forces -- ended in November. The entire territory of Western Europe from northern Norway to Turkey and the waters of the North Atlantic and the Mediterranean were turned into a gigantic military test range. Over 300,000 servicemen representing all branches of the armed forces of the bloc's countries, using a large quantity of military equipment and weapons, rehearsed "battles" following the scenario planned in NATO for a new world war.

The bloc's strategists do not conceal the fact that they are seeking to use these actions to bring psychological pressure to bear on the civilian population and servicemen, to force them to believe in the "Soviet military threat," and to persuade them of the need for the further buildup of NATO's military preparations. Everywhere the militarist rehearsal was accompanied by additional fuelling of anti-Soviet military hysteria.

The NATO maneuvers, taking place in the immediate vicinity of the borders of the USSR and the other socialist community countries and under conditions close to a real combat situation, were of a graphically expressed provocative nature. Here measures to train the troops, naval forces, and administrative organs were carried out on a scale that could ensure they developed into wide-scale aggression.

During the maneuvers, the foreign press has reported, there was a practical verification of the aggressive concepts and plans for the strategic and operational deployment of troops and their entry into war and questions of the use of conventional weapons and weapons of mass destruction -- nuclear and chemical. Special attention was paid to the rehearsal of the delivery of an in-depth echeloned strike in accordance with the NATO "follow-on force attack" concept. The Western press also calls this "the Rogers plan," named for its creator, the U.S. General B. Rogers, NATO supreme allied commander in Europe. The NATO command envisages introducing all provisions of this plan into the combat and operational training of the bloc's allied armed forces in the eighties.

Its thrust consists of creating military superiority over the Warsaw Pact states in conventional armaments and favorable conditions for conducting combat operations with a view to defeating opposing armed forces in the initial period of a war without using nuclear weapons. The NATO military leadership, the Western press emphasizes, believes that at the very start of a war its armed forces would succeed in simultaneously destroying the Warsaw Pact countries' troops' fire weapons through the full depth of their combat formation, including second echelons and reserves, even before they are brought into battle. According to Rogers himself, the destruction of the Warsaw Pact troops' second echelon should take place "by using ultramodern electronic reconnaissance facilities and new missiles with conventional loading, but with exceptionally high technical specifications." Therefore, it is planned to train NATO troops to conduct highly mobile offensive operations.

The main power of the imperialist bloc -- the United States -- has exerted and is continuing to exert decisive influence on the formation of NATO's coalition military strategy and its concepts. The Pentagon has a firm hold on the main levers of control of the NATO military machine. Its concept of the "air-ground operation" in a somewhat altered content and under the name of the "follow-on force attack" concept has migrated to the NATO staffs. They are both links in the U.S. strategy of "direct confrontation with Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

Bourgeois propaganda tries to depict the "Rogers plan" as though the Pentagon's chief representative in NATO were counting on conventional weapons and trying to weaken the West's dependence on nuclear weapons. This is nothing but a crudely fabricated propaganda play. Rogers himself admits that nuclear weapons are still the main means of armed struggle and the NATO command "will make first use of them if the relevant situation takes shape." The modernization of conventional weapons should be viewed as a substantial addition to the improvement and buildup of the bloc's nuclear potential.

Rogers has frequently set forth his views on the use of general forces and nuclear weapons in a war in Europe. Thus, in an interview with THE WALL STREET JOURNAL he insists on improving the NATO "flexible response" strategy, including in it the concept of delivering strikes against the second echelons and reserves of the Warsaw Pact countries at the earliest possible stage of development of hostilities. It is also emphasized that in any war variation -- nuclear or conventional -- it is planned to conduct hostilities only on the territory of the Warsaw Pact countries. This is one more obvious testimony to the aggressive nature of NATO's strategic premises.

Inasmuch as the attainment of military superiority over the Warsaw pact countries in conventional armaments is a condition of the implementation of the "Rogers plan," the NATO leading organs have adopted a long-term (through 1995) program for building the bloc's allied armed forces. The foreign press notes that the program provides for their equipment with new, highly effective armaments, the modernization of existing models, and the development of complex automated systems of reconnaissance and troops and weapon control and electronic warfare means. Based on the latest achievements of scientific thought, these weapons have colossal destructive force and in terms of their destructive properties come close to tactical nuclear weapons. The implementation of the measures in the long-term program, in the estimation of NATO specialists, will make it possible in the event of mobilization to rapidly (within 48 hours of starting it) change the correlation of the sides' forces in terms of personnel and combat equpment in NATO's favor.

Special priority in the development and production of new types of armaments is given to high-precision weapons with a large capacity for resolving fire missions without increasing the numerical strength or fighting strength of their troops.

What specific types of high-precision weapons does this mean?

The U.S. magazine DEFENSE ELECTRONICS describes the new types of weapons of this kind, primarily the location-strike complexes. The precision location-strike system (PLSS) is designed to effectively locate and deliver massive strikes against enemy targets equipped with radar stations and communications facilities to a depth of 500 km. According to Western military specialists' figures, up to 15 targets can be destroyed simultaneously. Western Europe plans to have several PLSS complexes.

Tests have been completed on location-strike complexes of the assault breaker type designed to destroy enemy armed groupings at a depth of up to 200 km from the front line.

The Pershing-2 missile and ground-, air-, and sea-launched cruise missiles with conventional charges are designed to deliver strikes against deep enemy targets including stationary targets. All these missiles have a sufficiently high degree of accuracy. It is planned to use the F-16, Tornado, and other tactical aircraft with highly accurate guided missiles and bombs for the same purposes.

With a view to placing a material foundation beneath the "Rogers plan," measures are being taken to improve existing NATO combat equipment. For instance, the ground forces' fire and strike power is being increased and their mobility is being enhanced.

According to foreign specialists' reports, the modern Abrams, Leopard 2, and Challenger tanks with which the NATO countries' armed forces are equipped and considerably superior to previous generations of tanks in terms of their combat qualities. New types of munitions are being created and their range, accuracy, yield, and area of destruction are being increased. These types of munitions include high-explosive munitions [boyepripasy obemnogo vzryza], missile salvo fire systems, and others.

The "follow-on force attack" concept is virtually a component of U.S. strategy which, according to a statement by Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, is aimed at achieving "total and undisputed U.S. military superiority." These dangerous designs are based on fallacious calculations. An explicit and clear statement is made on this score in the report on the meeting of the Warsaw Pact states' top leaders at which M.S. Gorbachev provided information on the course and results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. "The Warsaw Pact states," this report says, "state once again that they are not seeking military superiority, but they will not allow such superiority over themselves either."

The party will seek consistently, the draft of the new edition of the CPSU Program states, to ensure that the process of the consolidation of security, trust, and peaceful cooperation in Europe started at the Soviet Union's initiative and with its active participation develops, deepens and encompasses the whole world. The broad, constructive program of measures aimed at the halting of the arms race, disarmament, and the safeguarding of peace and the peoples' security -- a program upheld by the CPSU and the Soviet state -- provides, together with other measures, for the limitation of conventional armaments and the halt of the creation of new types of such weapons which in terms of their destructive force are close to weapons of mass annihilation.

But, it must be considered that the continuing adventurist gamble on force accompanied by the unbridled buildup of both nuclear and conventional NATO armaments cannot fail to increase the threat to peace. This fact obliges Soviet servicemen to enhance their political vigilance and to be in a state of constant readiness to repel any intrigues of the aggressor.

PRAVDA REVIEW OF WEEK'S INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

PM081520 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 85 First Edition p 4

[Yuriy Kharlanov "International Review"]

[Text] Turnaround Needed

Each day more and more people are beginning to understand that the arms race, above all the race in nuclear missiles, must be halted and that the world must turn away from fueling tension toward detente.

Indeed, the recognition of this truth was contained in the Soviet-U.S. joint statement issued at the Geneva summit, when both sides noted that nuclear war must never be unleashed and that there can be no winner in it. Speaking in Fallston last week, the U.S. President reiterated those words from the joint statement.

But if that is the case, measures must be taken to completely remove the threat of nuclear catastrophe from mankind's life. With that aim in mind, M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, noted, "the Soviet Union offers an all-embracing package of measures blocking all routes to the arms race -- either in space or on earth, be they nuclear, chemical, or conventional weapons."

Our country does not strive for military superiority over the United States. The Soviet Union has submitted concrete, precise proposals for overcoming the arms reduction deadlock at the talks now being held in Geneva, Vienna, and Stockholm. If necessary the USSR is ready to begin with partial albeit limited accords while bearing in mind the main aim -- to halt the arms race and prevent it from spreading to space -- just to begin that turnaround whose necessity mankind is coming to realize.

All the peoples of the world in all countries and on all continents have an interest in that. The situation in the world is now causing "grave concern because of the increase in the danger of war and tension resulting from the policy of imperialism's aggressive circles, which are driving mankind toward possible nuclear catastrophe," says the joint communique on the results of the visit to the USSR by R. Mugabe, first secretary and president of the Zimbabwe African National Union-Popular Front party and prime minister of Zimbabwe.

The WPC Presidium Bureau, in whose work in Stockholm over 100 representatives of anti-war organizations and movements from almost 50 countries took part, outlined a broad action program for 1986, which the United Nations has declared International Peace Year. The main obstacle to resolving the burning problems of maintaining peace and securing disarmament, the statement adopted at the bureau session says, is the U.S. "star wars" plans.

The problem of preventing the arms race in space is now particularly acute for all those states which Washington intends to involve in its "star wars" program. Involvement in the creation [sozdaniye] of a new class of armaments -- disguished as a space "shield" but designed to secure for the United States the capability to deliver a first nuclear strike is utterly incompataible with the security interests of other states and, indeed, of those very countries which are scrutinizing these U.S. proposals.

A session of the Executive Board of the Social Democratic Party of Germany held in Bonn reaffirmed this major party's resolute opposition to the "star wars" program and other similar projects. The British Labor Party has also confirmed its rejection of the space militarization plans.

The British Government thinks differently. It has adopted a course of participation in the "star wars" program.

For those who think in stereotypes and the preconceptions of the cold war days, the time has now come to soberly evaluate the situation which has been created in the world and understand the futility of pinning hopes on a policy of strength. The first signs that such changes could happen appeared in Geneva. "The process toward peace talks between the United States and the USSR has begun," retired Admiral E. la Rocque, director of the U.S. Center for Defense Information, states. "A bridge has been built, movement back from the brink of war has begun. The world's two most powerful leaders have stated that they are striving to move toward the prevention of nuclear war."

As is well known, the Soviet Union is ready to go its half of the way and has already made a number of major specific moves in this direction. It is now up to the United States.

Generals Seeking Revenge

The journalists covering the sessions of NATO's military organs held at the bloc's headquarters in the Brussels suburb of Evere this week were in for something of a surprise. NATO's Military Planning Committee, whose work involved the defense ministers of 14 bloc member-states (excluding France and Iceland), completed its work not in 2 days, as planned, but in 1 day. It is reported that the spare time was used for bilateral contacts between ministers.

The Military Planning Committee and the NATO Eurogroup, working the day before, included in their respective final communiques one point each containing a positive assessment of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva and expressing the hope of achieving "substantial progress in this sphere." However, all the subsequent points of the NATO documents demonstrate the complete opposite.

Did the ministers who signed the Military Planning Committee communique really not understand that their support for the U.S. position on the matter of "strategic, defensive, and space systems" is encouragement for the U.S. "hawks," headed by Pentagon chief C. Weinberger, who do not conceal their intention to wreck any possibility of arms reduction? Or do they not know that NATO's programs for building up armaments, including nuclear arms, in Western Europe are aimed not at lowering military confrontation on the contrary, at exacerbating it?

Both communiques speak about the bloc partners' intention in the near future to implement plans to sharply increase NATO's armaments and modernize them. In 1986 alone the forces stationed in Western Europe will received 900 new tanks and armored vehicles, hundreds of aircraft, and dozens of warships.

And subsequently, as General B. Rogers, commander in chief of NATO forces, Europe, has announced, it is planned to begin modernizing the charges of heavy artillery and tactical missiles. In this process both the artillery and the missile may be equipped with shells and warheads consisting of neutron bombs, which are already in production in the United States. Most of the aircraft now being received by NATO, particularly the Tornado and F-16 fighter-bombers, can also be used as nuclear weapon delivery vehicles. And finally the defense ministers in their communique confirmed their intention to continue the deployment of Pershing-2 and cruise missiles -- U.S. first-strike nuclear weapons -- in Western Europe.

Projects clearly contrary to the spirit and even the letter of the Geneva meeting were discussed not only at the plenary sessions but also during the bilateral contacts. For instance, C. Weinberger used his meeting with his British counterpart to elaborate the final version of the Anglo-U.S. memorandum concerning Britain's participation in the "star wars" program, which was then signed in London last Friday.

Weinberger also headed a pressure campaign against Dutch Defense Minister Jacob de Ruiter, whose government decided to reduce some of the Dutch Army's tasks in the tactical nuclear arms sphere in accordance with the NATO general's strategic plans. The Hague is doing this from political considerations, believing that to reject a certain proportion of the tactical nuclear arms deployed on Dutch soil will make it easier to secure the ratification in parliament of the decision taken against the will of the overwhelming majority of the Dutch population to deploy 48 U.S. cruise missiles in the country. However, NATO greeted even that compromise with hostility. Six types of tactical nuclear weapons plus cruise missiles, and not a warheads less -- that is the filling for the nuclear pie which the Pentagon and NATO have cooked up for one of the most densely populated countries in the world.

FRG Defense Minister M. Woerner used the bilateral meetings in the recesses between NATO sessions to familiarize his partners with the idea produced in Bonn of the so-called "European Defense Initiative," which is a copy in both name and nature of Reagan's "star wars" programs. The Bundeswehr generals and West German military-industrial monopolies are proposing to create [sozdat] weapons systems designed to destroy missiles and aircraft by means of military-technical facilities which are already under development [razrabotka] within the "star wars" plans' framework. What they are talking about are laser devices and electromagnetic guns. A DER SPIEGEL journalist reports that Gen B. Rogers "speaks very highly" of the "Woerner plan." He "considers such a system perfectly feasible if the Europeans pool their potential and combine their work with the U.S. SDI program."

Well, the "Woerner plan" reaffirms that there are forces in West Germany desperate to get hold of the most complex and lethal types of armaments. And if they are not allowed to have nuclear bombs can they not try to go one better and acquire the technology of weapons of the "space generation," thereby overtaking not only the supposed enemy but also their closest allies. However, these dreams of the "Wunderwaffe" -- or "miracle weapon," in its modern form -- will hardly win peacemaker's laurels for Bonn or Minister Woerner in person. It is unimportant whether Bonn develops [razrabatyvayut] its own types of "star wars" weapons by itself or in conjunction with other West European countries; the very fact that it is doing so at all is an act of provocation against the cause of detente and nuclear arms reduction.

The NATO military committees' sessions and the bilateral talks held in Evere showed once again that NATO's ruling generals are working flat out to prevent the implementation of the accords reached in Geneva and that the Atlantic military-industrial complex continues to be a log-like obstacle on the road leading to a real relaxation of international tension.

Increasing Opposition

Press attention this week was drawn to events in South Korea, whose dictator, Chon Tu-hwan, who came to power after a military coup in 1980, is stepping up repression against the forces struggling for the democratization of political life. Young students were again the target of the repression, as they have been many times in recent months.

In Kwangju city a group of students seized the U.S. Cultural Center library and hoisted placards bearing the slogans "Shame on Washington -- the Butcher of South Korea!" and "Down with the Dictatorship!" To storm the building and arrest three girls and six unarmed men, the goons used 500 policemen reinforced by officers of the U.S. special services.

This violence caused particular indignation among South Korea's democrats because the latest tyrannical act took place in Kwangju where, in May 1980, the regime brutally suppressed a popular uprising in which over 3,000 people were shot or beaten. Furthermore, this bloodshed took place with Washington's knowledge and involvement and it was U.S. officers, to whom the South Korean Army is still subordinated, who gave permission for troops to be sent into Kwangju.

Discontent with the policy of Washington, which has turned South Korea into a support center for its militarist policy in the Far East and maintains the antipeople regime there, is ripening among the broadest masses of the South Korean population. For the U.S. and Japanese transnationals, South Korea has long been a source of cheap labor and field for the unfettered and most subtle exploitation of the working people.

But what does the South Korean population get from the fact that the country has been turned into a reserve for the monopolies and from its hasty and disjointed industrialization? Nothing but more exploitation, new burdens, and deprivations. South Korea's foreign debt now stands at $45 billion, which, per capita, is perhaps surpassed only by Israel. The country is utterly dependent on fluctuating conditions in the capitalist world market. The volume of South Korean exports began to fall this year; approximately 2,000 factories and plants in the country have closed, and unemployment has risen 60 percent in the past months. The monopolies' only need in South Korea is for a low-skilled cheap workforce, and as a result 50 percent of university graduates are unemployed.

The regime supported by U.S. bayonets suits Washington primarily because South Korea is a bridgehead for U.S. imperialism in the Far East. The country is crammed with U.S. nuclear weapons and is a base for U.S. espionage and sabotage centers.

As the Western press acknowledges, each month the regime is losing ground, to the increasing dissatisfaction of its protectors. At the parliamentary elections in February the ruling party polled 35 percent of the vote and only managed to retain its majority in the National Assembly by wheeling and dealing. The New Democratic Party of South Korea, with 102 out of 276 seats, advocates the removal of the dictatorial regime and the improvement of the political climate in the country. Last week this party's deputies, protesting against the increase in military spending and tax benefits to big capital planned by the draft budget, declared a hunger strike in the National Assembly building and the indefinite occupation of it. And even though the regime managed to force the draft budget through parliament, the opposition stated that it does not intend to end its opposition.

Not only the population of South Korea but also the world's entire democratic public are demanding that the police repression in the country be ended and that South Koreans be given a change to obtain democratic rights and freedoms.

PRAVDA EDITORIAL COMMEMORATES HUMAN RIGHTS DAY

PM101021 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 85 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Human Rights Day"]

[Text] Today is Human Rights Day. It is observed by decision of the United Nations and is devoted to problems occupying an important place in contemporary international life.

Human Rights Day in the Soviet Union is held under the sign of the continued flourishing of genuine people's power and the all-round development of socialist democracy, which guarantees working people broad political and socioeconomic rights.

Great October opened to the working people the path toward active participation in political, economic, and social life. Graphic evidence of such participation today is the deep interest of millions of Soviet people in accelerating the country's socioeconomic development. The discussion of the precongress documents has become a truly nationwide forum.

"The CPSU believes," the draft new edition of the party program says, "that at the present stage the strategic line of development of society's political system consists in improving Soviet democracy and exercising to an ever greater degree the people's socialist self-management on the basis of daily, active, and effective participation by working people and their collectives and organizations in resolving questions of state and social life."

The creative force of socialist self-management is vividly manifested in the growing activeness of the soviets, which now number in their ranks around 2.5 million representatives of workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, and also in the activity of the trade unions, the Komsomol, labor collectives, people's control organs, the mass public organizations. The role of all links of people's self-management will increase even more with every passing year.

The Soviet people's historic gains in building socialism are inextricably linked with the fundamental advantages of the Soviet system in all spheres of sociopolitical, socioeconomic, and cultural achievements. A major gain of socialism is the enjoyment of equal rights by all the nationalities and ethnic groups populating our country.

The capitalist world's position on human rights is in striking contrast to this. The history of capitalism is the history of the predatory exploitation of the working people's masses, the enslavement of whole peoples, expansionist wars and conflicts, and the flouting of elementary human rights and freedoms.

Tens of millions of people in the capitalist countries are still without rights, doomed to poverty and a vegetative existence. Capitalism denies mankind the most natural and vitally important right -- the right to work. In the industrially developed countries of the West, there are currently more than 30 million "superfluous people." According to official statistics, more than 33 million Americans live below the poverty line and 3.5 million people have no housing. There are 15 million unemployed people in the "Common Market" countries -- Britain, Italy, the FRG, and others.

Bourgeois propagandists shed crocodile tears over the mythical "violations" of human rights in the socialist countries, thereby striving to divert attention from the incurable vices of capitalist society.

Persecutions of "dissidents" in the United States and other Western countries are being stepped up, police raids on peaceful demonstrations by members of antiwar movements are becoming more frequent, an offensive is being waged against trade union rights, and acts of terror and violence are being perpetrated against progressive public figures.

The state terrorism of the imperialist countries, aimed at suppressing the peoples' freedom and independence, is particularly dangerous. Imperialist circles' interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states and their support of racism, Zionism, and bloody dictatorships flout the basic principles of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights adopted by the UN General Assembly and the most important provisions of the Helsinki Final Act.

The Soviet Union and other socialist states firmly adhere to the international legal principles approved by the United Nations. Every people has the inalienable right to be sovereign masters of their land and to determine their own fate. Our state favors respecting the national independence of other countries and provides effective and selfless assistance to peoples defending their freedom.

The Soviet state proceeds from the fact that it is only in conditions of peace that mankind's main right, the right to life, can be ensured. Imperialism infringes this right also.

Today there is no more urgent task than to remove the threat of nuclear catastrophe, toward which the world is being pushed by the arms race unleashed by imperialism's most aggressive circles and by their desire to extend it into space. Taking account of this, the Soviet state recently put forward a series of new peace initiatives. The Soviet side spoke from the principled positions of the defense of peace and the peoples' security during the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva. The peoples of the world have assessed highly the Land of Soviets' constructive and realistic approach to the resolution of the key problem of today -- halting the nuclear amrs race, reducing nuclear arsenals, and preventing space being transformed into the arena for "star wars."

The Communist Party and the Soviet state will continue to do everything to ensure that Soviet citizens' socioeconomic, political, and personal rights are expanded and enriched and that favorable conditions and guarantees are created for their full implementation, the further improvement of socialist democracy, and the consolidation of world peace.

FURTHER ON ASTEC DISCUSSIONS IN MOSCOW

Plenary Session Opens

LD102111 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 10 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] A plenary session of the ninth annual meeting of members of the American-Soviet Trade Economic Council -- ASTEC -- opened today in Moscow. This nongovernmental organization was set up in 1973. Today it numbers among its members more than 230 U.S. companies and associations of U.S. industrialists from a number of states. On the Soviet side around 120 ministries, departments, organizations and enterprises permanently participate in the work of the ASTEC. ASTEC is called upon to promote the development of mutually beneficial trade-economic and scientific-technical cooperation between the USA and the USSR.

Those assembled were greeted by Comrade Aristov, honorary director of ASTEC, USSR foreign trade minister. He stressed that the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva had given a new impulse to the development of multi-faceted links on an equal and mutually beneficial basis. Baldrige, honorary director of ASTEC, U.S. secretary of commerce, read out a message of greetings to the meeting from U.S. President Reagan, and noted the important contribution which business cooperation makes to the development of relations between countries and peoples.

Baldrige Reads Reagan Message

LD101156 Moscow TASS in English 1116 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 10 TASS -- The first plenary meeting of the ninth annual session of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council (ASTEC) opened here today. It is being attended by the heads of Soviet ministries and Soviet foreign-trade organizations and by more than 400 representatives of U.S. business circles, among them directors of major U.S. corporations. A wide range of problems of Soviet-U.S. trade-and-economic cooperation are being discussed during the ASTEC'S work. Boris Aristov, minister of foreign trade of the USSR, addressed those present in a speech of greetings.

The present meeting of the ASTEC, he pointed out, is being held in a special period. The recent summit meeting in Geneva opened up an opportunity of a turn for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations. Concrete practical deeds in the spirit of the joint statement on the results of the Geneva summit are needed to translate the opportunity into reality. The development of equitable mutually beneficial contacts between the two countries could tangibly promote deeper mutual understanding and the creation of an atmosphere of trust in Soviet-U.S. relations.

U.S. Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige read out a message of greetings to the participants in the meeting from President Ronald Reagan of the United States. The message points out that the ASTEC is "important because it brings together commercial leaders from the United States and the Soviet Union. General Secretary Gorbachev and I decided in Geneva that such exchanges and contacts are an essential part of the long-term effort to build a more stable relationship between our two countries." The participants in the meeting heard reports by ASTEC co-chairmen Vladimir Sushkov and Dwayne O. Andreas.

Deputy Trade Minister's Remarks

LD101313 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1105 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, 10 Dec (TASS) -- The scale of economic cooperation between the USSR and the United States could be expanded considerably, Vladimir Sushkov, USSR deputy minister of foreign trade stated here today. He was speaking at the plenary session of the ninth annual meeting of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council (ASTEC).

The Soviet Union will expand trade and improve forms of cooperation with firms from the developed capitalist countries, including the United States. Such cooperation is quite possible if the difficulties which exist in pruchasing U.S. technology, and those caused by a lack of credits disappear, Vladimir Sushkov noted. The volume of Soviet-U.S. trade continues to be far from the economic capabilities of two of the biggest countries in the world.

The elimination of political restrictions, and firm guarantees that U.S. companies will fulfill the obligations they have adopted would substantially improve their competitiveness in the Soviet market, the deputy minister of foreign trade said.

U.S. Ambassador's Comments

LD102047 Moscow TASS in English 2019 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 10 TASS -- The U.S. regards trade as an important element of Soviet-American relations, Arthur Hartman, U.S. ambassador to the USSR, has said. He spoke at the luncheon that was given today for the Soviet and American co-chairmen of the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council (ASTEC).

The present ASTEC session can make an important contribution to ensuring more stable trade and economic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States, Arthur Hartman stressed.

At the same time, the U.S. ambassador repeated in his speech the notorious ideas on the need to link Soviet-American trade relations with the policy of preserving restrictions on the deliveries of modern American technology to the Soviet Union.

Komarov on Trade Development

LD102048 Moscow TASS in English 2022 GMT 10 Dec 85

["Nikolay Komarov on Soviet-American Economic Relations" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 10 TASS -- The USSR comes out for the development of mutually advantageous discrimination-free trade with all the countries, including the U.S. and there exist good prerequisites for it. This was stated here today by the First Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade of the USSR Nikolay Komarov who spoke at the luncheon held by the co-chairmen of the 9th session of the U.S.-USSR trade and economic council which is under way in Moscow.

The growth of Soviet exports to the U.S. would promote the increase of trade turnover in bilateral trade, Nikolay Komarov said. We favour the development of trade on a stable and long-term basis.

Demichev Receives U.S. Mayor

LD102156 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Demichev today received Diane Feinstein, mayor of San Francisco, who is staying in Moscow in connection with the holding of the 9th annual meeting of the American-Soviet Trade and Economic Council. The conversation dealt with questions of cultural ties between the two countries.

Murakhovskiy Meets U.S. Executives

LD101518 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1400 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Today Comrade Murakhovskiy, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Agro-Industrial Committee, received Mahoney, president of the U.S. firm of Monsanto. During the meeting, which passed in a businesslike atmosphere, concrete issues connected with the further expansion of mutual cooperation in agriculture and other branches of the agro-industrial complex were discussed. The same day Comrade Murakhovskiy received Stiritz, chief executive officer of the U.S. firm Ralston Purina. Issues connected with deepening cooperation in livestock raising and the food industry were discussed.

Ryzhkov Addresses Officials

LD101649 Moscow TASS in English 1631 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 10 TASS -- Nikolay Ryzhkov, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, today received the leading American members of the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council [ASTEC], including its co-chairman Dwayne O. Andreas, deputy co-chairman John Murphy and president James Giffen, who are staying in Moscow to attend the council's 9th annual meeting here. Taking part in the conversation also was Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Boris Aristov.

There took place a thorough exchange of opinions on issues related to the Soviet-U.S. relationship, especially those concerning the current state of bilateral trade and economic relations and prospects for their further development.

Nikolay Ryzhkov said that the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva has opened up opportunities for normalizing the Soviet-U.S. relationship and achieving a general improvement in the international situation. But realizing the positive potential of the Geneva meeting requires practical and purposeful actions by both sides. This fully applies, Nikolay Ryzhkov said, to trade and economic relations between the two countries, which should be built on a basis of equality and mutual benefit. At present the nature and scope of these relations do not correspond to the existing opportunities. The reason why this is so is the U.S. discriminatory trade policy which has shown itself to be not sound ever more obviously. [as received]

Developing Soviet-U.S. trade and economic cooperation would meet the interests of both sides. In this connection stress was made on the positive role of the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council, an association of U.S. business circles and Soviet foreign-trade organizations, which promotes this cooperation.

Gorbachev Receives Baldrige

LD101921 Moscow TASS in English 1855 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 10 TASS -- Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee received in the Kremlin U.S. Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige, who has arrived in Moscow to attend the 9th annual meeting of the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council, and had a conversation with him, which also involved Soviet Foreign Trade Minister Boris Aristov, U.S. Ambassador to the USSR Arthur Hartman and U.S. Under Secretary of Commerce Bruce Smart.

During the conversation Mikhail Gorbachev pointed out the major significance of the Geneva meeting, first of all in terms of the opportunities it has provided for normalizing Soviet-American relations and improving the international situation in general. It was stressed that although it is just the first steps that have been made and the USSR and the United States continue to be separated by major disagreements, especially in the fundamental issues of security, the overall result of the meeting has still been positive.

The main thing is that a discussion has been started of the explosive and acute problems which have been piling up for years and which it is high time to move from the dead center. The real significance of everything agreed upon in Geneva of course can only manifest itself in practical politics.

So far as the Soviet side is concerned, it treats the accords reached in Geneva most seriously and will seek improvements not only in the general atmosphere but also in the content of the Soviet-U.S. relationship on the basis of mutual respect and complete equality without any discrimination. The USSR is prepared in a spirit of fair interaction with the United States to work to reverse the arms race, while keeping it out of space, and improve the world situation. We have the right to expect a similar approach also from the United States.

All this, Mikhail Gorbachev said, fully applies also to the commercial and economic sphere. The Soviet Union treats most seriously the intention of both sides, recorded in the joint statement on the Geneva meeting, to develop trade and economic relations. Regrettably, the situation existing in this field can by no means be called satisfactory. The reason why is well-known: It is the discriminatory policies of the United States and its attempts to use trade as a tool for political pressure on the USSR.

It is clear, however, that this policy has outlived itself.

The Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev said, is a reliable and promising partner, the potentialities of our market are great, especially now that we are tackling the challenging tasks of accelerating the country's social and economic development. Our trading partners in other countries know this well and are making use of these opportunities to their no small benefit.

Mikhail Gorbachev voiced satisfaction with the fact that the U.S. business community, as has been demonstrated, for instance, by the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council's meeting, is showing interest in broadening mutually advantageous trade with the Soviet Union. On this score they will find complete understanding on the part of our relevant organizations. There are substantial potentialities for large-scale and long-term trade and economic relations between the USSR and the United States. It is up to the American side to use them.

Malcolm Baldrige spoke in general for developing U.S.-Soviet trade, especially after the Geneva meeting, and reiterated the American business community's interest in it.

At the same time he pointed to the constraints, imposed by the U.S. Administration and Congress, that hinder the development of commercial relations with the USSR. Discussed during the conversation also were some other aspects of the Soviet-U.S. relationship.

Baldrige on Talks

LD102202 Moscow TASS in English 2139 G.T 10 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 10 TASS -- Malcolm Baldrige, U.S. secretary of commerce, described trade as an important element in developing more constructive relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. He was addressing a press conference held here today after the meeting of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, with the participants in the annual meeting of the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council (ASTEC). Malcolm Baldrige said that the sides had agreed that well-developed business ties should lie at the basis of stable bilateral relations.

I arrived in Moscow to demonstrate the U.S. Administration's support for the development of peaceful trade between the USA and the USSR, he stressed. A record number of American businessmen has arrived here to attend the work of ASTEC. Malcolm Baldrige said that the meetings and talks in Moscow could be considered a success.

A program of measures for the development of bilateral trade for 1986 has been discussed. It provides, in particular, for the participation of American companies in trade exhibitions in the USSR. A regular session of the mixed Soviet-American commission on trade is to be held in Washington next year. It will be attended by a Soviet delegation led by Boris Aristov, USSR foreign trade minister. At the same time, the U.S. secretary of trade said that the U.S. Administration did not intend to revise in the visible future laws limiting trade with the USSR.

Gorbachev Dinner Speech

LD102116 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast; speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, at 10 December dinner in the Kremlin in honor of U.S. Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige and the U.S. delegation -- recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave a dinner in the Kremlin today on the occasion of the ninth meeting of the U.S.-Soviet Trade and Economic Council in Moscow. Present at the dinner were Comrade Ryzhkov, leaders of ministries and departments, directors of the council on the Soviet side, and other officials. Present on the American side were Malcolm Baldrige, Ambassador Hartman, and representatives of U.S. business circles. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev gave a speech at the dinner.

[Begin video recording] [Gorbachev] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen, comrades! I am pleased to greet the participants in the regular annual meeting of the U.S.-Soviet Trade and Economic Council in the Kremlin. We value the great work which the council has been carrying out for 10 years now, in assisting the development of contacts between American firms and Soviet foreign trade organizations. We value it all the more because, as we know, these years have not been easy. I also want to address words of greetings to Mr Baldrige, U.S. secretary of commerce, who has come to the meeting. We value his presence here.

The present meeting again bears out the fact that the cooperation of people, of peoples and states with different social systems and different ideologies, is quite feasible -- and today, I would say, very necessary. Whether we like one another or not, we have to live on this planet together. And for this reason, a very important task for us -- and I spoke about this both in Geneva and after Geneva -- is to master the art of getting on with one another. I want to give you one piece of information -- you have translations on the tables. [Gorbachev addresses translator in undertones] that needs to be translated.

[Unidentified translator speaking in English] The general secretary is saying that the American participants have the translation of the statement on their tables.

[Gorbachev] And since this is for a long time we should learn to live side by side in a human and civilized manner. And here arises the question about trade-economic and scientific-technical links between the United States and the USSR, and in general, as people tend to say, between East and West. We look at these links first and foremost from the point of view of politics, because, first, it is in the sphere of politics that the chief question of our relations is decided -- the question of war and peace. All the other aspects of our relations, including trade and economic links, are called upon to serve this main cause. Second, this is because our countries are two economic giants, quite capable of living and developing without any trade with one another. This is how it is actually going now. Judge for yourselves: In our trade turnover, the United States, one of the greatest trading powers of the world, holds 13th place -- a long way behind Finland, Belgium, and Austria.

And we occupy 16th place in the United States' trade turn-over. U.S. imports from the USSR are approximately equal in volume to its imports from the Ivory Coast republic. I do not see any economic tragedy in this. You can get by without us just as we can without you. And all the more so since there are quite enough trade partners in the world today.

But is this politically normal? I reply decisively: No, and again no. In this dangerous world we simply cannot and we do not have the right to disregard such stabilizers of relations as trade, economic, and scientific-technical links. And if we desire really strong and stable relations capable of ensuring a reliable peace, their foundations must include developed trade relations as well.

Our age is one in which each country and each people, not just the large ones but even the very smallest, regard their independence as of the very greatest importance and defend it with all their efforts. Nonetheless, we all have to deal with the growing interdependence of states. This is an objective consequence of the development of the contemporary world economy and at the same time it is an important factor of international stability. We should welcome such mutual dependence. It is capable of becoming a powerful stimulus for the construction of stable, normal and, I would even not be afraid to say, friendly relations.

Esteemed guests, we well understand the complicated nature of the tasks facing all of us. I know that among you there are heads of firms which occupy eminent positions in the U.S. military business. I shall not hide the fact that we consider that this military business has a dangerous influence on policy. Indeed, this is not only our opinion. The very concept of the military-industrial complex was formulated not by Marxists but by the conservative Republican, President Eisenhower, who warned the American people about the negative role which this complex could play.

I am speaking thus not in order to reproach our guests today who have contracts with the Pentagon. They have come to Moscow and we welcome this fact. It seems to me that it is evidence of the common sense of certain representatives of the military business. As far as I can see, some of them -- like business circles in the United States in general -- cannot fail to be worried by the economic and financial consequences for a country of excessive military expenditure, as well as by the consequences caused by militarization and the one-sided development of the economy. As for the Soviet leadership, we are deeply convinced that halting the arms race is in keeping with the genuine and vital interests not only of the Soviet Union, but also of the United States; that is of course, if we look at the essence of the question and are not guided merely by the transient advantages of a particular contract.

To learn to live in peace -- and I think that this is our common and prevailing interest -- means not only to refrain from wars. Full-blooded life differs from being chilled with fear at the fresh growth in the danger of war in that it presupposes the development of multilevel contacts and cooperation, including in trade.

I consider the development of trading and economic links between our countries to be a political problem also because the main obstacle on their path has a political, not an economic nature. The first such obstacle is that the so-called Most Favored Nation status has not been extended to the USSR. This term is sometimes misleading in that it creates the impression that it is a matter of a particular favorable inclination on the part of the United States toward those to whom this status is granted. But American businessmen are well aware that this is not so. In fact, Most Favored Nation status is no more than an absence of discrimination -- above all, of course, of customs tariffs.

About 120 countries, as I have been told, enjoy such a status in the United States. The Soviet Union is refused this. This, of course, creates barriers in the way of our exporting many types of goods to the United States. This deprives us of the possibility of earning the means necessary for the purchase of American goods. We cannot, after all, go on indefinitely receiving foreign currenty from let's say, Western Europe, and spending it in the United States. Our trade partners won't understand that.

Second, the obstacles imposed on us in the United States with respect to credits. It is not up to me to prove to you experienced businessmen that there can be no serious trade without credits.

The third obstacle is the so-called export control, that is, the ban on the export of very many types of goods, under the pretext that this may help military production in the USSR and thereby inflict damage on the United States' security. There is particularly much speculation on this theme. I would like to say above all, that the version that the defense potential of the USSR is allegedly virtually completely based on Western technology which has been acquired, and cannot develop without it, is the most utter nonsense. The authors of this story have simply forgotten what country they are dealing with -- either they have forgotten, or else they just want to force others to forget that the Soviet Union is a country of great sciences and advanced technology, a country of outstanding scientists, engineers, highly qualified workers. Of course, just like any other country, we rely as well as on our own, on world achievements of science and technology, on worldwide experience in production, both in civil and military production. That is life, it is an inevitability, and the United States itself is an example of this.

It is no secret that, let us say, a decisive role in creating nuclear weapons and missiles, was played not by American science and scientists, but by European scientists -- including Russian and Soviet scientists. One must not forget either the real facts of the present day, nor the lessons of history. Allow me, in the interests of truth, to recall a few of them. It is a fact, after all, for example, that the theoretical foundations of missile technology were discovered and developed by the outstanding Russian scientist Tsiolkovskiy; that it was in our country that the foundations of the concept of multistage rockets were laid: that the first experimental rockets were created; and that, finally, the first artificial earth satellite was launched -- not to mention man's first flight into space.

One could say a great deal about the contribution of Russian and Soviet scientists, from Mendeleyev to the present day, to the development of modern chemistry. I will limit myself to recalling the fact that from 1950 to the present day one-half of the transuranic elements have been discovered by Soviet scientists. The enormous, and in many ways decisive, contribution of Soviet scientists in the development of the theory of chain reaction, the theory of light and radio waves, and the discovery of the laser is an indisputable fact. Modern aerodynamics, super-low temperature and super-high pressure, almost all types of technology used in present-day metallurgy -- all this would have been impossible to imagine without what has been done by the scientists of the Soviet Union.

But we are not saying, in this instance, that American corporations are working on technology stolen from the USSR. We, like you, are interested in the development of scientific and technological links and in cooperation. This is a normal and legitimate interest, and I would like everyone in the United States to understand that we will not become a market for obsolete goods. We will only buy things that correspond to high world standards. And if the United States continues its present policy, then we will make what we need ourselves or acquire it from other countries.

There is one other obstacle to the development of our commercial and economic ties -- this is the policy of boycotts, embargoes, punishments, violation of commercial contracts, that has become customary for the United States. You yourselves know what the results are. The Soviet Union has not sustained particular damage, but the commercial reputation of American business, and thus its competitiveness on the Soviet market, has suffered seriously. Our economic planners have lost confidence in their American partners. So, most often, they give preference to others. This is what happened with major orders for pipe-layers, for equipment for the Novolipetsk metallurgical works, for an aluminum works in Siberia, not to mention the purchase of oil and gas drilling and prospecting equipment, where the share of the United States in our purchases has fallen to less than 0.5 percent.

Nevertheless, you know better than I the state of the world economic market, and specifically, the fact that in the foreseeable future one should expect an exacerbation of competition on the world market. I will be competely frank with you: Until these obstacles are eliminated there will be no normal large-scale development of Soviet-American trade nor any other economic ties. We regret this, but we will not beg the United States for anything. But if these political impediments are removed, I am sure that broad prospects will open up before us.

We are not your competitors on the world or domestic markets. The Americans have more difficulties in this with their allies than with us. But we could beecome partners, natural partners, and, I assure you, honest and reliable ones. For this, of course, both you and we would have to do some work on it: make a better study of each other's markets, improve the mechanism of economic cooperation.

I know that we too are not innocent here. The Soviet Government has a sufficiently critical attitude to our foreign trade organizations too; in our view, new forms of production cooperation and scientific-technological cooperation are possible. We are presently doing much work on this level with the socialist countries. We consider the deepening of economic integration with them to be a most important task. We will also be expanding trade and other forms of economic cooperation with Western Europe, with Japan, and with the developing states. We would like economic relations with the United States not to be left out of this process -- both for political reasons, about which I have spoken, and for economic reasons.

We have very great plans for the development of our economy, science, and technology. And for this purpose we would like to make maximum use of the additional opportunities which are being opened up by international cooperation, including also with the United States. Large long-term projects can be involved, and also a multitude of medium and even small deals, which can interest both giants and small and medium businesses.

If the situation is normalized and if a reliable political and legal contract basis is created for the development of trade and economic relations, we will find things both to buy from you and to sell to you. We could invite American companies and firms to take part in our programs for the further development of the energy sector of the economy. We could also think about partial participation [dolevoye uchastiye] by American firms and companies in our large-scale work on fundamentally modernization machine tool manufacture and other sectors of the engingeering complex.

If they show appropriate interest, American firms could probably join in what is being done in our country in the agro-industrial complex, chemicals, petrochemicals, the production of sets of machines, and facilities for the introduction of intensive technology in land cultivation and animal husbandry. But, for all this, the appropriate political will is necessary. It is necessary to build economic relations on a long-term basis. Guarantees are needed that some or other political fads [povetriya] will not start undermining business relations again.

And now permit me to return to politics once again. Only 3 weeks separate this ASTEC meeting from the Soviet-American meeting in Geneva. Herein lies its special significance. As I understand it; it is devoted to the analysis of potential opportunities for cooperation between the USSR and the United States in the economic sphere, to seek out what must be done for the sake of the broadest interests both of the Soviet and the American peoples. The understanding that the present state of Soviet-U.S. relations is unsatisfactory and dangerous was the main thing which led myself and President Reagan to the meeting and talks in Geneva. I am sure that the President of the United States, just as I, felt at the time hundreds of millions of men and women, and even children, of both our countries and also of all other countries, were looking to Geneva, were looking with hope and at the same time with anxiety.

I will tell you outright that it was not at all an easy experience. But neither I, nor, as I assume, the President found it possible to turn aside from this immense burden of human anxieties and hopes. If one takes into account how complicated the road to Geneva was, one can consider that it was something of a success. But this is only the first step. And each next step will require even greater efforts and even greater readiness to listen, desire and ability to understand and to meet one another half-way and, most importantly, the readiness to master the very difficult art of reaching agreements on an equal and mutually acceptable basis, without which serious problems can never be solved by us.

In other words, we have entered an exceptionally crucial period when words, intentions and political statements need to be translated into concrete decisions and deeds. As you will understand, it is a matter of decisions and of deeds which could contribute to smoothing out Soviet-U.S. relations and to a general improvement in the world political climate.

A high degree of enterprise, a sense for the new, an ability to find unexploited possibilities for growth are characteristic of many representatives of American business circles. I am convinced that the best and truly promising possibilities of this kind lie today not on the path of destruction and death, but on the path of peace, on the path of the uniting of efforts in the name of equitable and mutually beneficial cooperation among all countries and peoples. In this there is life, and the benefits from it are indisputable.

Allow me to wish ASTEC success in its useful activity. Thank you all for your attention. [applause] [end recording]

[Announcer] Malcolm Baldrige spoke in reply. The speeches were listened to attentively. The dinner took place in a friendly atmosphere.

Baldrige Dinner Speech

LD102056 Moscow TASS in English 2031 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 10 TASS -- Official toast by Secretary Malcolm Baldrige at dinner in Kremlin:

Mr General Secretary, members of the council and distinguished guests:

Mr General Secretary, in the spirit of frankness and truth that marked the summit, let me say that I have visited your great country in May and I have visited your country in December -- and I liked May a lot better.

But I came back in December perhaps for an even more important reason than in May. I come now to reaffirm, after the summit, President Reagan's desire for expansion of peaceful trade as a definite part of expanding our overall relations.

Peaceful trade helps build the foundation for stable overall relations. Its effort goes far beyond the exchange of rubles and dollars involved. Mr General Secretary, as you have stated trade creates a certain interdependence and encourages contacts that contribute to an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect. I believe the 400 American businessmen who have travelled here feel the strength of that potential contribution as do your own trade officials led by Minister Aristov. And our countries are too great and powerful to feel that that interdependence could lead to over-reliance by either side. As two superpowers, of course we have some difficult problems. Our systems are different and we have to learn to live with those differences while advancing the cause of peace throughout the world. The world has applauded the leadership shown by you and the President at the Geneva summit and the fact that you and he will exchange visits over the next two years.

Obviously increased trading relations cannot solve all of our problems and obviously those same trade relations must move parallel to a great extent with our other relations. But thanks to your leadership and the President's, we have a good beginning and the ingredients for future success.

I would ask my American and Soviet friends to stand and join me in a toast to General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev.

D.O. Andreas, ASTEC co-chairman from the U.S. side, expressed high appreciation in his speech of the work of the 9th annual session of ASTEC members and spoke out in favour of the development of trade and economic relations between the USA and the USSR.

Reaction to Gorbachev Speech

LD110634 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Moscow Radio's Sergey Yegorov interviews U.S. delegates to U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council on 19 December; delegates' remarks recorded]

[Text] Reight after the dinner given by Mikhail Gorbachev in honor of the participants to the ninth session of the U.S.-USSR Trade and Economic Council this Tuesday night, I talked to several people on the U.S. delegation. I first approached James Giffen, president of the U.S.-USSR Trade Council:

[Giffen] I thought Mr Gorbachev's speech was extremely useful; I thought it was well thought out; I thought it laid the issues out objectively, and certainly laid out the position of the Soviet Union in a clear and distinct way. I think all Americans who attended the meeting felt that it was a positive contribution to the dialogue. The tone of the speech and of the dinner tonight, I think, was one of a partner who wanted to continue the process that was started at Geneva, a partner who wanted to make real progress in U.S.-Soviet relations in general and U.S.-Soviet trade in particular.

[Yegorov] And that was James Giffen, and here is Casey (Anticen), president of McDermott International Trading Company:

[Anticen] A spontaneous reaction is: a very good leader. He means obviously very well; he gives a clear message; and I think we all believe that it would be possible to come to much understanding between our two great nations -- your nation; our nation, the United States -- (?that) we follow clear thinking and do not try to outdo each other. And I think trading is the best tool, because that's where we meet people, we become friends, and there is a great variety of people in trading that can meet, much more than when you send a soccer team or a tennis team that's only a few people. Trading is such a wide (?spectrum) and if people start to meet and become friends [word indistinct] improve the relationships tremendously.

[Yegorov] And another person I talked to was Jack Ray, senior vice president of Tenneco Incorporated.

[Ray] This was a very impressive meeting, and I thought the general secretary was very realistic, very practical, but very firm and very friendly toward the United States, and clearly indicated that he feels that increased trade will help smooth our difficulties. And while he readily admits and understands that we are politically different and different sorts of societies, we're going to live in this world together, and that we must do that and we must learn to do it in a peaceful way. It was a very good speech, I thought. It is not realistic for the Soviet Union not to have most-favored-nation status. As he clearly pointed out, it doesn't mean anything particularly favorite; it just means you're getting treated as well as everybody else. That's what he said, and that's what it is actually. In fact, not having it is, as he pointed out, a form of discrimination.

[Yegorov] Jack Ray. This evening I also talked to James Gray, president of the National Machine-Tool Builders Association, who said he also thinks to further trade all barriers should be removed.

[Gray] Obviously all of those things are important. I would hope that all of these things come to pass, because I think it's in both countries' best interests that we are able to overcome some of the trade barriers that have been put up, primarily, frankly, by my own country. I've never been in agreement with them, and that goes back to my very first visit here in January of 1971. I don't believe in a lot of those policies.

SHULTZ, THATCHER DISCUSS SDI, EAST-WEST TIES

LD101748 Moscow TASS in English 1714 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] London, December 10 TASS -- Talks have opened here today between British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, who arrived on a one-day visit in London.

As is pointed out in the statement issued by the prime minister's office, much attention at the talks was devoted to East-West relations in the light of the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva, the situation in the field of arms control.

Yet, as observers note, the main subject on the agenda of the consultations was the so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative".

It is pointed out here that Shultz came to London only a few days after the British Conservative Government signed with the Washington Administration a memorandum on mutual understanding providing for Britain's participation in research work under the "star wars" programme. Observers point out in this connection that the U.S. secretary of state intends to use the signing of the memorandum for bringing additional pressure to bear on the other West European countries with the aim of making them follow London's example and also join in the implementation of the Strategic Defence Initiative.

U.S.-SOVIET FRIENDSHIP COUNCIL LAUDS GENEVA SUMMIT

LD110521 Moscow TASS in English 2124 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] New York, December 10 TASS -- The National Council for American-Soviet Friendship has come up with a statement which stresses the significance for the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva. The meeting is a milestone on the way to consolidating international peace and security, to normalizing relations between the Soviet Union and the United States. It set the beginning of a positive process. The favourable opportunities that have emerged should not be missed, the statement says.

However, no agreement was achieved in Geneva on the most important problem -- the termination of the arms race. The so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" which is stubbornly defended by the U.S. Administration remains the principal obstacle on the way to it, on the way to international peace, the statement stresses.

MAIN ASPECTS, IMPLICATIONS OF SUMMIT REVIEWED

PM101235 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 11 Dec 85 pp 1, 2

[Burlatskiy, Yu. Izyumov, and A. Frenkin report: "Geneva: Yesterday, Today, Tomorrow"]

[Text] Geneva, Moscow -- Moment of Truth

In every intelligent person's life, sooner or later a moment comes when he wants to stop, look back on where he has been, and understand the meaning of his life on earth. That moment of truth can often overturn everything in his mind and make him reexamine the supposed values by which he has lived and turn to the true values, the only values of significance for existence.

Now such a moment of truth is arriving for all mankind. Let us recall once again M.S. Gorbachev's words: "At the turning points in history, it can happen that moments of truth are as necessary as the air itself. The international situation has become too dangerous because of the intensified arms race and too many fables are woven about it, intimidating people. A real need has arisen to dispel this mist and test words against deeds."

We were at the press conference, which everyone remembers, when these words were spoken. We will probably never forget our sense of the significance of what happened in Geneva during the days of the meeting between the leaders of the two great powers.

The situation -- simple and piercing -- is that our world has reached the very brink of the abyss. Practical, very practical people in the United States and throughout the West, people harnessed to the chariot of day-to-day life, managers, generals, and scientists, are creating more and more new military toys every month, every day. They push aside the thought of when and how these toys will be put into practice and used. No doubt many of them would shudder if they were to clearly picture in their imagination that every new nuclear charge they create contains half a million human lives. How many of these toys have been accumulated in the 40 years of rivalry started by the United States under Harry Truman and foisted on us and many other countries? Some 50,000 atomic charges! Is that not enough? Is that not sufficient to guarantee the total destruction of every living thing on earth? Or do we have to take with us the neighboring planets, other worlds which have hitherto been inaccessible to the malicious will of human genius?

The sinister realities of the nuclear age do not allow further progress on the path of military confrontation, total political confrontation, along which aggressive circles in the United States and other capitalist countries seek to lead the world.

That is why the world awaited the Geneva meeting with tremendous hope. Now, analyzing its results, politicians and the press in many countries associate the success of the talks with the Soviet leadership's new approach to foreign policy problems. This approach is realistic and dialectical at the same time. Of course, nobody had any illusions about the U.S. side's readiness to resolve in a businesslike way the main questions -- disarmament and the renunciation of the militarization of space. But we could be waiting many more years for the viewpoints to come closer together. We must not delay. We must take any opportunity to make peace more reliable.

This position accords with the aspirations of reasonable people in all countries. Appeals for talks to take place reached Moscow from everywhere.

And the Soviet Union did everything in its power to make the meeting a practical success. The ending of all nuclear explosions, the unilateral moratorium on testing antisatellite weapons, clear and concrete proposals on disarmament and other vitally important questions, and, lastly, restraint in polemics were major positive preconditions for the dialogue between the two countries' leaders. We were not guided by narrow interests in this; we were acting in the name of all mankind's future.

We remember a typical episode: On 19 November M.S. Gorbachev received representatives of U.S. antiwar organizations at the Soviet mission. They brought a peace petition with 1.5 million signatures. Looking at the countless boxes containing signatures, Mikhail Sergeyevich said:

"How many human hopes!..."

In his report at the USSR Sepreme Soviet session M.S. Gorbachev said: "A dialogue between top leaders is always a moment of truth in relations between states."

A moment of truth, a moment of insight... The words which all mankind needed were found, were pronounced by our country's leader, were spoken directly and frankly to the U.S. President in one-on-one conversations. In the program very little time was allotted for these conversations, but in practice they took up a large part of the time allowed for the talks, some 6 hours in all. This annoyed the President's entourage, who for some reason were afraid to let him out of their control. Journalists heard how, before the first such meeting, Reagan Jr., who was present in Geneva as a correspondent, looked at his father and asked worriedly: "Are you ready, Dad?"

Since the content of the two leaders' conversations was not publicized, the reporters sought any kind of indirect evidence about the atmosphere. Everyone agreed that at each new meeting the mutual greetings were warmer. "The ice is broken" -- that phrase was repeated in newspapers in the most diverse countries. Businesslike contact had been established between the leaders of the world's most powerful countries. And although people's satisfaction at this was even then laboring under the burden of very serious concern about U.S. plans for putting weapons into space, people were keen to hope for a triumph of reason. They were glad to learn that after a walk in the park near the U.S. President's villa, the interlocutors entered a little house on the shore of Lake Geneva and sat by a blazing fire. As though they hoped that the chill in relations would be lessened by the fire...

Reassuring reports reached the press, but the conversations themselves, as M.S. Gorbachev said later, "were extremely blunt at times. Nonetheless, it seems to me, they were also to a certain extent, productive."

After the final meeting a member of the U.S. delegation summed up:

"It seems that in some respect you have convinced our President a little."

The chief gain from the meeting lay in the recognition by the leaders of the two great powers that nuclear war must never be unleashed, that there can be no winner in such a war, and that neither of the two countries will seek to achieve military superiority.

The tremendous, purposeful work on our part had not been to no avail. The hopes of millions of people were not disappointed.

"Can you explain how your people managed to include the phrase about preventing an arms race in space and stopping the arms race on earth in the joint statement?"

A U.S. correspondent of our acquaintance practically flung this question at us immediately after the statement was issued.

That question is not surprising if you recall what was being written and said in the United States on the eve of the Geneva meeting and what results were predicted. The only thing in no particular doubt was the possibility of agreements on cultural and scientific exchange, consulates, and air communications. "The SDI is not open to discussion, the time has not yet come for disarmament," representatives of the administration said, "but we will speak at the top of our voices about human rights and Soviet interference in various regions." There will be no joint communique, official White House spokesmen warned. The President himself, according to the U.S. press, believed it would be considered a great success if it proved possible to even agree to continue holding meetings.

As for reactionary political forces -- which, unfortunately, are extremely influential at present in the United States -- they were against holding the talks at all and did everything they could to wreck them.

In light of all this, the actual course of the meeting appears an undoubted achievement in itself.

"What is the first reaction in the United States to the results of the meeting?" We asked prominent U.S. journalists. Their answers amounted to the following. The reaction is twofold. Some people rejoice, together with the whole world, at the changes for the better and hope that more will be achieved in future. Others are perplexed: How could this man who is famous for his anticommunism spend 6 hours alone with the communists' leader and even find something to agree with him about?

"You must understand," one of our U.S. colleagues said, "everything you have heard Reagan say before about your country, about socialism and communism, was an expression of his true convictions, and at his age it is not easy to shake such convictions. If he has realized that communists are people like everyone else and that you can hold talks with them and reach agreements, that is tremendous progress."

The following instance may give some idea of the difficult nature of the work done prior to Geneva and at the talks themselves. THE NEW YORK TIMES, speaking of the preparation of the agreement on contacts and exchanges in the sphere of science, education, and culture, wrote: "In order to conclude the agreement, U.S. and Soviet representatives have met 65 times in the last 15 months. Their talks lasted more than 200 hours."

The Psychological Climate

We would like to stress the value, for its own sake, of the psychological breakthrough in Western public opinion during and after the Geneva meeting. The correspondent of one of Britain's leading newspapers described how his father telephoned him from London: "Something quite unbelievable is happening, the whole of Britain has spent 1 and 1/2 hours listening to the Soviet leader's press conference. Speeches by our own country's leaders or the leaders of any other Western country have never been listened to so attentively. I think it is an unprecedented new phenomenon in our attitude to the Soviet Union, its policy, and its leader."

All of the press unanimously noted the importance of the work of our group of experts, diplomats, and journalists in explaining the Soviet position. In the quest for first-hand information, the major television and radio companies and the press from the United States, Britain, France, the FRG, Switzerland, and other Western countries gave them generous air time, published long interviews, and asked them to comment on every problem discussed at the talks.

Suffice it to say that each of the experts (among them one of the authors of these lines -- F.M. Burlatskiy) gave at least 20-25 interviews. Now representatives of the Western press are themselves looking with surprise at what they call an "unprecedented boom" in Soviet information and propaganda, especially in the conditions of the decision, taken on U.S. initiative, to report nothing about the progress of the talks themselves.

Here is what the FRANKFURTER RUNDSCHAU wrote about this: "In terms of the quality of the work done with the public, the Soviets clearly beat the Americans. A delegation of highly qualified experts arrived in Geneva a week before the meeting -- state officials, scientists, and military men, who immediately started holding press conferences and willingly gave interviews... The Americans were simply disheartened by the Soviets' sudden superiority in the struggle for public opinion. They tried to create a similar information system in a short space of time, but it did not work. However, in any case it would have been difficult for the Americans to select a team of highly qualified experts who could successfully 'sell' the 'star wars' program. When the Swiss organizers of the meeting offered to place the U.S. press center in the Hall of Congresses next to the Soviet press center, the Americans refused, preferring isolation in a fashionable hotel. The Soviets accepted the Swiss side's proposal and only gained by it; the journalistic battles were now mainly played out in the Geneva conference center."

In any event, a substantial breach has been made in the Iron Curtain with which the Western mass media carefully conceal from the masses the truth about our country and its foreign and domestic policy. Western journalists apparently felt the need for dialogue with our representatives, a dialogue which would be a continuation and reflection of the dialogue at the level of the top leaders of the two great powers. It is hard to say how long this mood on their part will persist.

Soviet scientists and journalists, for their part, see it as their task to continue the energetic activity in the spirit of Geneva to improve Soviet-U.S. relations and the entire international climate.

The Weinberger Detective Story

Practical conclusions must now be drawn from the joint acknowledgement of the impossibility of war between the United States and the USSR. The main conclusion is that it is time to end the military rivalry which is murderous for both sides and lethal for all mankind. Has this truth been fully grasped by our partners, their allies, and public opinion in their countries? That is the question we would like to answer in reviewing the responses to the Geneva meeting.

Examining these responses, you cannot help having mixed feelings. On the one hand, the predominant opinion everywhere is that Geneva was a major event in international life and that it is capable of laying the foundations for the process -- albeit prolonged and difficult -- of improving Soviet-U.S. relations and for more fruitful talks on limiting the arms race. Yes, we heard a sigh of relief from all over the world, because everyone is fed up of the acute confrontation and this dancing on the brink of the abyss. People are tired of living with the fear of nuclear explosions and the nuclear winter. And politicians have to reckon with this, one way or another. But on the other hand -- and we have no right to close our eyes to this -- we see that those who advocate continuing the military rivalry are not for a moment renouncing their objectives and their plans.

Readers already know that on the eve of the summit meeting a letter from U.S. Defense Secretary C. Weinberger to President Reagan appeared in THE NEW YORK TIMES. Immediately after the publication of this apparently strictly confidential message became known, we set off for the U.S. press center in the Intercontinental Hotel.

And we witnessed Mr Speakes, Mr McFarlane, and Secretary of State Shultz literally squirming in front of newsmen. Their attempts to prove that the Weinberger letter had gotten into the newspaper accidentally, as a result of some kind of "information leak" caused a burst of laughter in the hall. Even then, it was clear to everybody that the publication of this letter on the very eve of the talks was a move in a game designed to show the Soviet leader what "pressure" the U.S. President was under and how difficult it would be for him to travel "his mile" toward the Soviet side.

The article "Stolen Letter" which has now been published in the same NEW YORK TIMES adds a few new details to the so-called "leak" story. It reports that Weinberger had striven with all his might to be taken to the summit meeting in Geneva, but three officials -- Regan, Shultz, and McFarlane -- attempted to exclude him from the delegation. And the President agreed with them. The publication of the letter was Weinberger's countermove, so to speak. On board the presidential aircraft en route to Geneva one White House staffer said in response to a question from journalists about whether the Weinberger letter was designed to undermine the summit meeting: "Without doubt." As for the President himself, he is said to have been indignant merely about the fact that the letter had gotten into the press, not about the actual content of the letter. The Pentagon chief, the newspaper concludes, is almost invulnerable since he has been cooperating with Reagan for 20 years and enjoys his complete trust.

Ultimately, the crux of the matter does not lie in how Weinberger's letter got into the press or why. The crux lies in the letter itself and the nature of the "warnings" it contains. At the very beginning of the letter Weinberger warns the President on behalf of the Joint Chiefs of Staff against any encroachments on the "strategic modernization program" announced in October 1981 and also on the modernization of conventional forces and enhancement of their combat readiness. He warned the President particularly resolutely against, first, agreeing to continue to observe the SALT II provisions and, second, officially agreeing to restrict SDI research and development [razrabotka] solely to that said to be allowed "on the basis of the most restrictive interpretation of the ABM Treaty"; and, third, he opposed the inclusion in a communique or statement of provisions proposed by the Soviet Union concerning the importance that the sides attach to the observance of accords (meaning all previous treaties concluded between the USSR and the United States relating to the arms race limitation process).

To conclude this detective story let us cite the words of Weinberger himself about the summit meeting. He said: "I am very satisfied with the outcome of the Geneva meeting... As the President has said, it was a fresh start and augurs well for the future." A very alarming statement! It transpires that he is particularly gratified that the President's research program "will be unswervingly continued."

The Pentagon held a news conference a few days ago. A number of photographs illustrating the progress of work under the "star wars" program were shown. This news conference was manifestly an attempt to prove that the program is worth the billions of dollars being appropriated for it. Lieutenant General J. Abrahamson, leader of the organization for the implementation of SDI, stated that research is progressing very rapidly. However, many people in the United States believe that in practice such assertions are merely an attempt to get Congress to allocate more appropriations.

What Course?

Congress greeted the President with an ovation when he arrived in the United States following the end of the talks. But some people were overjoyed at what was achieved in Geneva, while others were overjoyed that there was no progress on the main problems.

"No" is a favorite word among rightists when it comes to Soviet proposals. They are now already concerned about the leaders' next meeting and have begun to bring powerful pressure to bear on the administration well in advance. Shultz has been chosen as the target for criticism. The extreme rightists are "blaming" him for the positive changes in Geneva.

The not unknown Brzezinski rushed to "justify" Reagan, stating that he was and remains an anticommunist and was unable to display the "firmness" expected of him in the talks merely because of his emotions.

Judging by his statements, R. Reagan himself does not want to spoil relations with any side. When addressing the public at large he stresses his contribution to ensuring that the danger of war has now diminished. But, he placates the rightists by saying the SDI project will be implemented.

The great complexity of U.S. political life is well-known. It is also well-known that there is no unity among the President's closest entourage: McFarlane's resignation immediately after Geneva is confirmation of this. Therefore, any conclusions must be drawn on the basis of actions, not words.

Unfortunately, the Soviet-U.S. joint statement included neither references to the ABM Treaty nor many other important provisions capable of reversing the arms race process.

Speaking in Congress on 21 November, R. Reagan said: "It was a constructive meeting. So constructive that I look forward to welcoming and receiving M.S. Gorbachev in the United States next year. And I have accepted his invitation to visit Moscow the following year."

That is what one aspect of his speech in Congress looks like. But there is also another aspect, which preserved almost untouched previous prejudices and destructive arguments. The President stressed that he adheres firmly to the line aimed at "strengthening our defense capability and alliances."

This means an intention to continue to implement all military programs planned by the United States and, first and foremost, the SDI program.

The President did not omit touching on the question of "Soviet expansionism in a number of regions of the world." But, he added an optimistic note, saying: "Nevertheless this meeting was worthwhile for both sides. A new realism spawned the summit; the summit itself was a good start; and now our byword must be: 'firmly continue to follow the same course.'"

"But what course? The course of continuing military rivalry and the arms race and taking weapons into space? Or the course of ending the arms race on earth and preventing it in space, as the Soviet-U.S. joint statement again reiterated? Despite the way it is depicted in the White House, these are not one and the same course, but two different courses.

Therefore, along with many sober-minded people throughout the world, we say: "Yes, it is good, very good, that a direct and frank dialogue has finally taken place between the leaders of the USSR and the United States and that important decisions were taken. But the moment of truth, the moment of enlightenment must come not only for us, but also for our partners and for all governments and peoples. That moment will come when the senseless and pointless arms race is finally ended."

In both the United States and other Western countries the acute struggle around this question is continuing and will maybe grow. The Soviet arguments have made a strong impression everywhere.

The leaders of Britain, France, the FRG, Italy, Japan, and other capitalist countries have made a unanimous positive assessment of the results of the Geneva meeting.

But when you read and ponder closely the point of the most positive reactions to Geneva, you can see how full they are of diverse nuances and often opposing judgments. There are also politicians expressing particular satisfaction over the points on which there was no narrowing of the gap between positions, primarily on the questions of limiting the arms race and preventing the militarization of space. There are a considerable number of expressions of concern about the future progress of talks on key problems of limiting the arms race.

There is nothing more dangerous for a new truth than an old delusion, Goethe wrote. Ths This applies completely to those who to this day are inclined in the struggle to strengthen national security to rely not on joint actions to limit arms, but on the unfurling of a further arms race. This applies primarily to the supporters of the SDI program, which, according to the general view, has become the main obstacle to ending the military rivalry.

In his report to the USSR Supreme Soviet session M.S. Gorbachev said: "...We are justified in saying that the overall balance from Geneva is positive... I wish to state that for its part the Soviet Union intends not to slacked the pace, but to strive with all States for the curtailment of the arms race and a general improvement in the international situation. We hope that the same kind of approach will also be displayed by the United States. Then, I am confident, the work done in Geneva will yield its real fruit."

Thus, the main things still lie ahead. As is known, the best attitude to the truth is expressed in its application in practice.

ANTHOLOGY OF SUMMIT-RELATED MATERIALS PUBLISHED

PM071921 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 7 Dec 85 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "In the Name of Peace on the Planet"]

[Text] The anthology "The Soviet-U.S. Summit Meeting" has been published. It contains documents and materials of the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. President R. Reagan in Geneva 19-21 November 1985, a report on the Prague meeting of the Warsaw Pact states' top leaders 21 November 1985, M.S. Gorbachev's report "On the Results of the Soviet-U.S. Summit Meeting in Geneva and the International Situation" at the USSR Supreme Soviet session 27 November 1985, and the USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On the Results of the Soviet-U.S. Summit Meeting in Geneva and the International Situation."

The anthology is published by the Political Literature Publishing House.

TOLKUNOV DESCRIBES DEVELOPMENTS IN TIES WITH PRC

PM101725 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by L.N. Tolkunov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Soviet of the Union: "Good-Neighborliness is Essential and Possible"]

[Text] At the invitation of the National People's Congress [NPC] a USSR Supreme Soviet delegation recently visited the PRC. It was a return visit -- an NPC delegation had visited the USSR in March 1985. The exchange of delegations signified the restoration of ties between the supreme organs of power of the Soviet Union and the PRC after an interval of nearly three decades.

After an 8-hour direct flight, the aircraft started to descend. The Great Wall of China could be faintly discerned as a thin yellowish thread below us, the mountain range was behind us, and a level plane extended as the sea opened up. The capital of the PRC, Beijing, welcomed us with mild, clear weather.

Of course, in a visit lasting a few days it was impossible to form a complete picture of the life and concerns of a country as large and varied as China. But it must be noted that the course toward modernization steered in the late seventies has already given rise to changes not only in overcoming the grave heritage of the "cultural revolution" but also in developing the country's economic potential and improving its cultural standard.

The PRC was proclaimed in Beijing 36 years ago. The victory over the forces of imperialism, feudalism, and reaction, which became a remarkable event in world history, worthily crowned the Chinese people's heroic struggle for national and social liberation and signified their embarkation on the path of socialism. The Soviet Union invariably supported the Chinese revolution and the Chinese working people's just cause in that struggle and was always on their side. There are many documents on Chinese soil commemorating Soviet people who gave their lives fulfilling their international duty in the joint struggle against the aggression of Japanese militarism.

The formation of the PRC opened up a new stage in the development of Soviet-Chinese relations. The historical tendency toward the two countries' close rapprochement had a firm and broad basis for development. But for approximately two decades this tendency has not only not developed but has dwindled.

In recent years Soviet-Chinese relations have been given definite impetus. The Soviet Union invariably and consistently advocates establishing good-neighboring cooperation between the USSR and the PRC, which are neighboring socialist states. As the CPSU Central Committee March (1985) Plenum stressed, "we would like a serious improvement in relations with the PRC and we believe that, given reciprocity, this is perfectly possible." That is the central idea with which the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation addressed its Chinese counterparts.

Both countries have great opportunities for developing effective and fruitful cooperation on the basis of equality, mutual advantage, and noninterference in each other's internal affairs. In recent years the volume of trade, including border trade, between the USSR and the PRC has been increasing, scientific-technical exchanges have been expanding, and there has been a discussion of questions connected with the Soviet Union's participation in the modernization and construction of a number of industrial projects in the PRC. In 1985 the relevant long-term intergovernment agreements were signed. Contacts in the field of culture and sports are increasing on a planned basis. Ties through public organizations have been markedly animated.

Political dialogue is becoming increasingly active, encompassing the exchange of opinions on topical international problems. The level of bilateral contacts is rising. On this plane, the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev and PRC State Council Vice Premier Li Peng was important. Useful ricoprocal visits by the two countries' deputy heads of government have taken place. Talks between the two states' foreign ministers during UN General Assembly sessions are becoming regular practice. There is an accord on the exchange of visits between USSR and PRC foreign ministers.

The PRC politicians and statesmen who received our delegation expressed satisfaction at the development of Soviet-Chinese relations recently and welcomed the resumption of parliamentary ties. The PRC's top state leaders -- Li Xiannian, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo Standing Committee and president of the PRC, and Peng Zhen, member of the CPC Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the NPC Standing Committee -- favored increasing trade and economic, scientific-technical, and cultural cooperation, continuing political dialogue, and improving its standard, and expanding ties between the two countries' supreme and local organs of power. The talks with them were of an informal and frank nature. It must be admitted that the exchange of opinions confirmed that our countries still have differing views on a number of questions, and this primarily applies to what the Chinese side continues to call "obstacles" on the path of normalizing bilateral relations.

Li Xiannian and Peng Zhen spoke as a whole optimistically of the prospects for normalizing Soviet-Chinese relations. We must talk more with each other and conduct dialogue in order to overcome difficulties and differences, the PRC president noted.

We were told that the PRC, steering an independent course in the international arena, advocates a considerable reduction in and then the abolition of nuclear arsenals and is opposed to the "star wars" plans. Beijing acknowledges the desirability of USSR and PRC representatives discussing topical world problems including through parliamentary channels. "The problem of peace dominates everything," Li Xiannian said. "No one needs war."

At the same time it would be wrong to bypass the fact that, unfortunately, statements are made and items are published in China which attempt to equate the Soviet Union's peace-loving foreign policy and the course of U.S. imperialism and to ascribe to our country's actions, including on questions of space research, which have nothing in common with reality. Propaganda items also make absurd territorial claims on the USSR.

The USSR Supreme Soviet delegation's meetings with Li Xiannian and Peng Zhen took place in the NPC building. It was here too that there was a detailed conversation with Peng Chong, vice chairman of the NPC Standing Committee, and other Chinese parliamentary officials.

Our interlocutors said that, despite certain differences caused by specific national features, the Soviet and Chinese organs of state power have a great deal that is similar in legal and functional areas. In this connection they displayed lively interest in many aspects of the activity of the supreme and local organs of power in the USSR and noted the value of Soviet experience for their practical work. The Chinese side gave a positive welcome to our proposals on establishing regular contacts between the standing commissions of the two countries' parliaments and between the two capitals -- Moscow and Beijing -- and also between Leningrad and Shanghai.

Changes are occurring within the PRC system of organs of power. In fact, they have only just emerged from the stage of restoration following the "cultural revolution." At present there is a continuing quest for forms and methods of practical activity by the organs of power, including structural and organizational aspects, selection of cadres, and so forth.

Deputies to the NPC and provincial people's congresses are elected for 5-year terms by indirect multilevel elections; while deputies to lower-level bodeies -- prefecture and country people's congresses -- for 3-year terms by direct elections. NPC sessions are convened once a year. The next session is scheduled for the first half of 1986. It will adopt the Seventh 5-Year Plan for the PRC's economic and social development for 1986-1990.

We were informed that of the 2,978 deputies to the latest, sixth, NPC, 62.5 percent are CPC members, about 30 percent are workers and peasants, about 25 percent are representatives of the intelligentsia, and about 21.2 percent are women. The social composition of lower-level organs of power is approximately the same. The overwhelming majority of deputies continue to work in their own organizations or enterprises.

The congresses of people's deputies at various levels, excluding the county congresses, elect permanent organs -- the standing committees. The NPC Standing Committee convenes once every 2 months. It not only monitors the observance of the Constitution but can itself adopt laws or amend them. The NPC confirms the PRC Government and monitors its activity; it elects the PRC President, who acts on the basis of resolutions by the NPC and its Standing Committee; and it forms the PRC Central Military Council.

The current congresses of people's deputies are the first to set up auxiliary bodies like specialized committees which are subordinate to their standing committees in the periods between congress sessions. NPC nationalities; legislative work; financial and economic; education, science, culture, and public health; foreign affairs; and overseas Chinese committees have been formed. The explanations by Chinese parliamentarians make it possible to conclude that the committees are only beginning their work and are essentially trying to find the most suitable methods and forms of activity.

The NPC is engaged in active international contacts. Since 1984 the PRC has been a member of the Interparliamentary Union. NPC Standing Committee Sessions regularly hear reports on the NPC's contacts with other countries' parliaments. Last June the NPC Standing Committee was briefed on the Chinese parliamentarians' visit to the Soviet Union.

It appears from explanations given by Chinese representatives that since the late seventies China has been seeking ways to implement the country's comprehensive modernization within a brief historical period. The task that has been set is to quadruple the GNP (in value) by the year 2000 in comparison with 1980 and to reach the level of the world's developed countries in 50-70 years' time. A large-scale economic reform has been lauched, affecting today both agricultural production and industry. This reform, according to Chinese officials, envisages the decentralization of economic management, broader development of commodity-money relations and financial autonomy methods, the increase of enterprises' economic autonomy, and the enlistment of various forms of foreign aid. The number of private enterprises and farms is growing. We were told that particular attention is being given to the enhancement of economic efficiency by means of incentives and the introduction of the achievements of the scientific and technical revolution.

Some results of the efforts which are being made are marked. Metal and machine production, coal and petroleum extraction, and light industrial and agricultural output have all increased in China. A lot of construction work is under way in cities and in the countryside and people are eating and dressing better. Much is also being done to raise the population's education standards and to encourage people's contacts with the achievements of the past few years.

The Chinese representatives declared at the same time that the process of implementing the economic reform is still at its initial phase, at the "experimental" stage, and that new and no less important or difficult problems arise as soon as the old ones have been solved. In this connection one noticed the increasingly frequent calls to combat the spread within the party and society of such "negative phenomena" as corruption, swindling, acquisitiveness, growing private-ownership moods, speculation, and smuggling; and also to strengthen plan discipline and the education, primarily of young people, in the spirit of revolutionary ideals and to struggle against bourgeois influence.

I would like to note the warm reception accorded to the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation. The Chinese population displayed on quite a few occasions their friendliness toward the members of the delegation as representatives of the Soviet Union. Locally there was high appraisal of the Soviet assistance given to China during the revolutionary struggle period and in the fifties, as well as of the work by Soviet specialists, and interest was expressed in the establishment of closer ties in different spheres.

One cannot fail to note the Chinese people's genuine interest in Russian and Soviet culture. We were told of the great popularity of works by modern Soviet writers and poets translated into Chinese and of feature movies made in the last few years. The Moscow Classical Ballet toured China in October and its shows in Beijing and Shanghai were attended by over 20,000 spectators. Extremely fruitful meetings took place at the same time between a group of Soviet writers and their colleagues and representatives of the public in China.

People in the Soviet Union -- and we invariably emphasized this -- believe that there has been and is no reason for the alienation of the USSR and PRC peoples. In our country the development of relations with China is not made subject to any preliminary conditions, and thus no barriers are being raised across the path of their development. Despite all the differences in approach to some, at times fundamental, problems, it is important to concentrate on those aspects where both countries have points of contact and potential for accord, and also to seek opportunities for positive advancement. The fundamental interests of the two socialist states provide an objective foundation for the development of good-neighborliness.

The further expansion of diverse Soviet-Chinese ties and contacts, including parliamentary ones, and mutual familiarization with experience in economic, social, and cultural building, would help the deepening of mutual understanding and the strengthening of the atmosphere of trust between the USSR and the PRC, the lifting of artificial barriers in bilateral relations, and the shifting of these relations to the tracks of equal and mutually advantageous good-neighborly cooperation. The visit by the USSR Supreme Soviet delegation to the PRC is yet another step toward the attainment of these important goals.

CHINESE PROGRESS IN SOCIALISM, ECONOMICS DETAILED

LD090027 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 8 Dec 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Feodor Burlatskiy]

[Text[I recently had the opportunity to visit China as a member of a group from the Soviet Friendship Society. It was an extraordinarily interesting trip. We went to Beijing, Shanghai, Nanking, Suchow and other towns in that country. Here you can see some of the photographs I took.

No doubt they are not very professional! [Video shows still color photographs of street scenes and other views of China] We visited both towns and villages, and wherever we went we were always given a warm and friendly welcome.

Of course, we were shown the majestic monuments of the culture of ancient China. But naturally it was present-day China that aroused our greatest interest. Each of our meetings, therefore, without exception turned into a very lively discussion and exchange of opinions about the things that concern and excite Chinese people, most of all at the present time. What excites them most of all is the economic reform which is being carried out in the country, and the major social advance that is accompanying it.

In the villages that we visited -- and no doubt they didn't show us the worst of them -- we talked to elders, directors of enterprises, and ordinary peasants. There are several points that are of interest here. For example, in one of the villages where there are 758 people who are capable of working there is a plot of land for each person amounting to less than 0.06 hectares. This reflects a situation common to the whole of China with its 800 million people living in the countryside. What solution is to be found to this extremely difficult demographic problem, this land problem, so to speak? The first thing is the changeover to family contracting [semeynyy podryad] and in some cases to section contracting [zvenyevoy podryad]. The land remains socialized, but individual plots are attached to homesteads or sections.

We saw the diligence with which the peasants labor from morning until late into the night, taking no account of the time and energy they are putting in. They manage to gather two harvests of grain crops each year from their diminutive plots. And two harvests of vegetables, too, which are planted in the same place between the strips of rice or wheat. The family sells some of the harvest to the state at a firm price; some it keeps for itself for its own consumption; and some it takes to market. These, and other, forms of economic management have given no small results. On a countrywide scale the grain yield has risen from 305 million tons to 407 million tons of grain crops per annum over the years of the reform, that is to say since 1979.

At the same time, property differentiation in the countryside has of course been intensified. We saw a boom in the building of housing and economic structures using good-quality brick. Mostly they are built by the more well-off peasant families. Frequently they fill the role of intermediaries in trade for their fellow villagers.

Some of these peasants already have some additional business activities, village hotels, small-scale processing enterprises, and others. Besides this, there is another problem that has cropped up. Small-scale economic activities enable one to make wide use of modern techniques and technology, and without this the further development of agricultural production is made extremely difficult. A major reform in the industrial field is now being implemented also. The main point of it lies in making enterprises truly independent, working on the principles of paying their own way, where a considerable part of the profit remains in the hands of the enterprise and some of it -- in the form of taxation -- goes to the state and also to the local government organs.

Moreover, particular significance is attached in China to the principle they call the system of the responsibility of the director, which means raising personal responsibility in general, retaining, at the same time, of course, party and state control over the results of the activity of the enterprises.

An integral part of this reform is the so-called open economic policy -- open for the wide use of foreign capital investment and credit in the country for the construction of joint enterprises. We heard more than a few contradictory opinions in this connection, particularly from Chinese scientists. While some people expect a large in-flow of investments and technology from Western countries and from Japan, others express fears linked with possible dependence and particularly with the rise in indebtedness to countries of capitalism.

All of this is being accompanied by widespread replacement of cadres. Suffice it to say that recently, approximately 1 million cadre workers volunteered, is customary here, to apply for retirement on pension. I met one of these volunteers and asked him how he feels now. With a smile he told me that his pension is not bad and that his main task now is the struggle for longevity. Well, in addition to that he takes an active part in public works.

The reforms in China are still only just beginning. The Chinese leaders call them the building of socialism with a specific Chinese character. They told us frankly, not just about the positive results but about the difficulties and the problems which require both attention and new solutions from them. In this connection they expressed great interest in an exchange of experience with us and with other countries of socialism, and in seeking the most effective forms and methods of economic life.

IZVESTIYA ON U.S.-JAPANESE ECONOMIC RELATIONS

PM100940 [Editorial Report] Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 December 1985 carried on page 5 a 2,100-word dispatch entitled "Fuji and Fanak" by Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences A.N. Gromyko, datelined Tokyo-Hiroshima-Moscow. The dispatch reports on a USSR Academy of Sciences delegation visit to Japan to take part in a symposium entitled "Peace and Security in Asia." During discussion with Japanese colleagues, it is reported, "well-known hackneyed arguments bearing a NATO and above all U.S. stamp were quite frequently expressed by them as if they were ventriloquist's dummies," but that "it was felt nevertheless" that the "keen Japanese mind had still not said its final word." The article then looks at economic issues, particularly Japanese-U.S. trade relations. It says that "U.S. big business today is particularly afraid of Japanese industrial competition," especially in high technology. Figures are cited to demonstrate the "contrary trends of a strengthening Japanese economy and a weakening U.S. one." "Increasing exploitation of Japanese working people" in terms of worsening working conditions and unemployment is the price being paid, according to the article, for the economic progress. It is claimed that the United States is pressuring Japan to spend more on arms: "The explanation of why the United States is pressuring Japan to involve its economy in an intensive arms race, including in space, with a growth in military expenditure beyond the ceiling of 1 percent of GNP set by the Japanese Government itself in 1976, is very simple. The United States is seeking a strategic goal -- to reduce the growth rates of the Japanese economy." The Japanese Government, it is said, is "yielding to this militarist pressure," although it is being resisted by working people.

EXERCISES 'CAMOUFLAGE' MILITARISTIC PREPARATIONS

LD092056 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 9 Dec 85

["Dangerous Games" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 9 TASS -- TASS commentator Aleksey Popov writes:

It has been announced in Tokyo that broad-scale American-Japanese command and staff exercises are to be held on the territory of Japan late in February next year, involving representatives of the staffs of the Ground Troops, Navy, Air Force of the two countries.

The exercises will continue a whole series of staff exercises which have been held by the Pentagon and the Japan Defence Agency for more than two years now. As is reported by the newspaper YOMIURI, the next February exercises, just as the previous ones, will have the aim to test strategic and tactical cooperation of the Armed Forces of the two countries in case of "extraordinary circumstances" in the Far East and the Pacific area. The next February exercises will be held on a higher level: The exercises will be directed by the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff of the Armed Forces of Japan and the commander of the American expedition corps in the Japanese isles.

The obviously aggressive aims are invariably set to the participants in such games: blockade of international straits in the western part of the Pacific, discovery and liquidation of "enemy" submarines, the ensuring of control over the sea lanes in the area of 1,000 miles around the Japanese archipelago.

The primary role in "carrying out" those operations is assigned to the Japanese Armed Forces, that is, as was noted by the Japanese newspaper AKAHATA recently, the main aim of the exercises is the training of Japanese Armed Forces for active participation in any warfare, that could be ventured by the United States in that part of the world. Writing on dimensions of such "involvement", the Japanese press reported that during Japanese-American staff exercises "Yamasakura-7", which were held early this year, the lines of routes on staff maps to those or other points crossed not only northern areas of the region but also "southern and south west areas of the Pacific".

The aims of the next February exercises are covered up by references to the mythical "Soviet threat", "Soviet military build up" in the region, etc. This is not at all a new method -- advancing absured "arguments" the aim is to camouflage the aggressive essence of militaristic preparations of the American-Japanese "security treaty" allies which are aimed by no means only against the USSR, but also other countries of the Pacific region.

CPSU AGRICULTURAL EXPERTS VISIT MONGOLIA

PM091925 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 4 Dec 85 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Interparty Links"]

[Text] In accordance with the plan for interparty links between the CPSU and the MPRP, a delegation of CPSU party workers led by V.K. Onisovets, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Agriculture and Food Industry Section, was in Mongolia from 27 November through 3 December. The delegation familiarized itself with the MPRP's experience of work in leading the development of agriculture.

The delegation was received by J. Batmonh, general secretary of the MPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Mongolian People's Great Hural Presidium.

KABUL AIRPORT BOMB KILLS 6, INJURES 20

PM101432 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Dec 85 Second Edition p 3

[Correspondent Major A. Oliynik report: "In Impotent Malice"]

[Text] A bomb planted inside a suitcase exploded at Kabul Airport 8 December. As a result of this latest terrorist action 6 people were killed and more than 20 injured. Most of them were Afghan Army servicemen who had been discharged in the reserve and were due to fly home on that day. Several persons suspected of committing the terrorist action have been detained. An investigation is in progress.

Suffering defeats in open combat, the counterrevolution is now relying on terrorist actions and is trying to sow fear among the population and paralyze the will of the people. But the attempts by the bandits and their imperialist patrons are in vain. The Afghan people cannot be intimidated.

SOUTH ASIAN COOPERATION GROUP 'MAJOR STEP'

LD091034 Moscow TASS in English 0959 GMT 9 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 9 TASS -- TASS news analyst Vasiliy Kharkov writes: The meeting of the heads of state and government of Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, the Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka, which officially inaugurated a South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation (SAARC), ended in Dacca yesterday. The importance of that event transcends the boundaries of the region. It was the first summit of those countries, which in itself is a politically significant event. A new page in the history of the region was written by the desire, stated by the participants in the forum, to pool their efforts and to seek the replacement of mistrust and conflicts, that grim legacy of the colonial past, with mutual understanding and cooperation. The acceleration of economic and social progress is the main task which the participants in the Dacca forum, as they stressed, decided to pursue within the framework of the new organization through regional cooperation on the basis of mutual respect, equality and common benefit. This is all the more important in view of differences between the political systems of the SAARC countries, and religious and ethnic differences between the peoples inhabiting them. Incidentally, it was on those differences that the colonialists based their infamous "divide and rule" policy, borrowed in good measure by those who are sowing discord and conflicts among the peoples today.

The positive results of the Dacca meeting are reflected in full in the documents approved by it, the declaration and charter of the association. The South Asian countries, which have an aggregate population of about one billion, or one fifth of the world's, have quite a few problems in common, which can be effectively resolved only by common efforts. The erstwhile difficulties, rooted in the colonial past, have lately been compounded by new ones, born of the predatory practices of international monopolies. These include growing foreign indebtedness and also trade protectionism, practiced more and more often by the USA and its allies.

Persisting international tension and the continued arms race are adversely affecting the solution of these acute problems, faced both by South Asian states and by other developing countries. The awareness of this fact by the participants in the meeting is reflected in the declaration, calling for immediate talks to conclude a comprehensive nuclear test ban agreement which could help freeze the nuclear arms arsenals.

As participants in the Non-Aligned Movement, the countries represented at the Dacca forum reaffirmed their profound conviction of the effectiveness of the lofty goals of that movement. They also reiterated their commitment to the principles of the U.N. Charter and to the ideals of peaceful coexistence. To sum it all up, a major step was taken in the development of regional cooperation and it is to be hoped that it would have a positive effect on relations between South Asian countries and on the situation in the region as a whole.

'SECESSIONIST' U.S. POLICY AGAINST DRA ATTACKED

GF091701 Tashkent International Service in Uzbek 1700 GMT 8 Dec 85

[Station observer commentary: "Whose Rights Are Those in Washington Asking About?"]

[Text] Dear listeners, the United States has submitted a report to the UN General Assembly's 3d committee on social and humanitarian affairs concerning the situation of human rights in Afghanistan. On what have the authors of the report based their claims, which accuse the DRA Government of violating human rights in Afghanistan?

One of the main provisions of the accusatory report is related to the implementation of land and water reform in that country. However, many hundreds of thousands of farmer families have received land because of the reform. They are rid of fuedal oppression. Currently, they are able to use water to work on their own lands. Water was considered the property of a handful of rich people in the past. This points to the fact that for the first time in history, the Afghan farmers have the right to freely work on their own lands and benefit from the result of their work.

Let us continue. Washington has described the law removing usury in Afghanistan as a violation of human rights. Usury, however, is the most dreadful social malady inherited by the DRA. Millions of farmers and artisans in the cities lived under the (?pressure) of usurers for centuries in Afghanistan. The national and democratic revolution put an end to usury and declared the accounts of 11 million people with usurers as settled. [sentence indistinct]

The move made by the United States may be based on logic. However, this logic is dreadful and illegal. The important thing is that the social revolution that has freed people from oppression has completely removed the rights and privileges enjoyed by the oppressors in the past. (?But due to their nature), the ruling circles in the United States cannot agree with this. They have endeavored to disrupt the effort made by socialist countries and the workers and farmers of Russia to establish their new states in the past. More recently, the leading country in what has been termed as the free world moved to impose its military power on independent Grenada. The leading country in the free world referred to is currently waging an undeclared war against the people of Nicaragua, who have terminated the rule of the oppressors. The leading country in what has been described as the free world has supplied funds and arms to the bands of murderers sent into the DRA. It is [words indistinct] that the United States, which is a great usurer itself and which endeavors to subject tens of countries in the world to the system of usury, is very much infuriated by the removal of usury in Afghanistan. In so far as they are concerned, this is a plot against free profit. It is a plot against human rights. In addition to directly using arms, it seems that the ruling U.S. circles also find it useful to resort to all the means of evil secessionist moves in the struggle against the people who have freed themselves from the rule of the oppressors -- including nonsensical remarks related to the question of human rights.

OLTEANU MEETS WITH GROMYKO, VISITS AIR FORCE UNIT

PM111046 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 Dec 85 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Talk at the Kremlin"]

[Text] A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received Colonel General C. Olteanu, member of the RCP Central Committee Plitical Executive Committee and Romanian minister of national defense, who is on an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union, in the Kremlin 10 December.

During the talk both sides stressed the progressive and stable development of Soviet-Romanian relations on the basis of the 7 July 1970 Treaty on Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Aid.

Both sides noted the great importance of the meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and N. Ceausescu for the all-around deepening of Soviet-Romanian cooperation. The joint desire to expand and deepen ties between the USSR and Romania in all spheres was stated and confidence was expressed that the strengthening of allied relations between the Soviet Union and Romania both on a bilateral basis and within the Warsaw Pact framework will serve as a reliable guarantee of their peoples' security.

The conviction was expressed for the need to improve cooperation among the CEMA members in the interests of the successful socioeconomic development of the members of that organization on the basis of accelerating scientific and technical progress with a view to resolving the task of further increasing their peoples' living standard.

There was an exchange of opinions on the situtation in the world, and particular attention was devoted to the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit at Geneva and their importance for the development of international relations. The sides expressed a unanimous opinion regarding the importance of the USSR and U.S. statements on the impermissibility of nuclear war and their agreement not to strive to achieve military superiority.

The Soviet side stressed that the long-term importance of everything useful that was agreed upon at Geneva must be seen in specific and practical matters. In this connection it was stated that the USSR intends, with complete resolve, and in a spirit of honest cooperation with the United States to strive to end the arms race and ensure an overall improvement in the international situation and that it is justified in expecting the same approach from the United States.

A.A. Gromyko and C. Olteanu noted the importance of the results of the Sofia conference of the Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee and the statement adopted at it which contains an extensive program for the struggle for peace, the removal of the nuclear threat, the prevention of the militarization of space, and the ending of the arms race. The sides reaffirmed the common assessment by the Soviet Union and Romania of the international situation and the reasons for its exacerbation given at the Sofia conference.

At the end of the talk A.A. Gromyko expressed the conviction that C. Olteanu's official visit to the Soviet Union will also be a contribution to the further strengthening of friendship and all-around cooperation between the peoples and armies of the USSR and Romania.

Taking part in the talk, which was held in a warm and friendly atmosphere, were Marshal of the Soviet Union S.L. Sokolov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister; Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov, USSR first deputy defense minister and commander in chief of the Warsaw Pact Joint Armed Forces; and T. Dudas, Romanian ambassador to the USSR.

Colonel General C. Olteanu visited an air unit at Kubinka 10 December. The Romanian guest familiarized himself with the pilots' combat equipment and lives, and was met by Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, commander in chief of the Air Force and USSR deputy defense minister. The Romanian minister of national defense was accompanied by Marshal of the Soviet Union V.G. Kulikov.

MARCHUK DISCUSSES S&T ISSUES WITH ZHIVKOV

PM051635 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Ties Developing"]

[Text] Sofia, 4 Dec -- T. Zhivkov, general secretary of the BCP Central Committee and chairman of the Bulgarian State Council, yesterday received G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, who is here in connection with the opening of Soviet Science and Technology Days in Bulgaria. During their conversation they examined questions of developing Soviet-Bulgarian cooperation in the sphere of science and technology.

ALBANIA SIGNS TRADE PACTS WITH BULGARIA, ROMANIA

PM091617 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Trade Agreements"]

[Text] Sofia -- A trade agreement for 1986 through 1990 has been signed here between Bulgaria and Albania, the BTA agency reports. In accordance with the document, Bulgaria will export ferrous and nonferrous metals, chemical industry products, machines and equipment, and other goods to Albania. Exports from Albania to Bulgaria will include electric power, bitumen, sulfur, clothing, copper wire, woodworking industry products, and other goods.

Tirana -- A trade agreement for 1986 through 1990 and a protocol on commodity circulation and payments for 1986 have been signed here between Albania and Romania, the ATA agency reports. Albania will supply Romania with electric power, coal, chromium ore and concentrate, copper wire, light and food industry products, and other goods. Romanian exports to Albania will include petroleum equipment, pipes and various types of steel, lubricating oils, chemicals, motor vehicle tires, and other goods.

COMMENTATORS ON UK-U.S. MEMORANDUM ON SDI

Ponomarev

LD072053 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 7 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 6 TASS [dateline as received] -- TASS news analyst Leonid Ponomarev writes:

A "memorandum of understanding" with the United States has been signed in London today. It envisages Britain's participation in research under the U.S. "star wars" programme which is called "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI). This was announced at a press conference which was held there jointly by British Defence Secretary Michael Heseltine and U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger who is visiting in Britain. The Tory Government has gone to this step in defiance of serious protests by the public at large and by scientists of their own country as well as by those in the whole of Western Europe. Putting it in medical terms, The Washington administration will undoubtedly use London's consent to cooperate in the space militarisation field mainly for the purpose of injecting the "cancer virus" of the SDI into the organism of the entire Western Europe.

This decision is quite unpopular, to Britain itself, in the first place, since it is connected with measures to transfer to outer space the race of arms, including nuclear, "exotic" and any other futuristic weapons of destruction, and not with a search for ways to remove the nuclear threat.

On the whole, the implementation of SDI projects undermines the very basis for solving the task of limiting and reducing arms and achieving disarmament. This is also a dangerous step to Britain, since participation in the U.S. military space programmes will make Britain's security still more fragile. Europe is oversaturated with nuclear and conventional arms already now and there are endeavours to add space strike weapons to that pile of arms.

The expectations that Britain's participation in the "star wars" programmes will bring sizeable profits to it and will revitalise the country's economy are, without any doubt, illusory, too. There is hope, in particular, to get military orders to the tune of 1,200-1,500 million dollars. The estimates made by U.S. specialists show something else. Complete realisation of the SDI will cost the Pentagon approximately 1,000,000 million dollars. Comparing the above-mentioned figures, it is easy to see that Britain will get only crumbs of the pie. And it will not be easy to get them either. By now the number of U.S. firms participating in SDI-related programmes is 240 and list will continue to grow. The true masters of the SDI -- the military-industrial complex and the higher echelons of U.S. military production -- are now in command in the competitive struggle, and not the U.S. Administration which promises wonders to London. Consequently, London has no firm guarantees that it will turn to advantage SDI-related orders. But expenditures on new arms by Britain itself will undoubtedly grow many times over.

The U.S. Administration will compel its British partner to purchase U.S. space weapons in just the same way as it now induces it to spent huge funds on the purchase of U.S. "Trident" nuclear-powered submarines and missiles. But then Britain's economic position is far from fine and the prospects do not hold out anything reassuring.

And finally, there is yet another aspect which is the most important one in the light of possible headway in easing East-West tensions. The decision of the Tory Cabinet to join in the SDI runs counter to the spirit of the Geneva summit meeting. Firstly, the whole world expects that, after Geneva, there will be developments in the direction of detente, the relaxation of tension, an atmosphere of trust, and the curbing of the arms race. Secondly, during the discussion of the questions of the talks on nuclear and space arms by the leaders of the USSR and the USA in Geneva, the sides agreed that the work at the talks would be expedited, meaning the accomplishment of the tasks set out in the joint Soviet-U.S. statement of January 8, this year, namely: to prevent an arms race in outer space and to end it on earth. London approvingly reacted to the efforts made in Geneva but nevertheless immediately joined in the U.S. "star wars" programme.

Bogachev

LD091934 Moscow TASS in English 1814 GMT 9 Dec 85

["The Thatcher Government and International Treaties" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, December 9 TASS - By TASS military news analyst Vladimir Bogachev.

Sensing the anti-war sentiment in Britain, officials of the Thatcher Government from time to time state their support for the existing Soviet-American treaties on arms limitation and reduction and express their allegiance to the idea of political and military stability in Europe and the world as a whole. However, in practice the government of Britain not only unconditionally approves the policy of the ultra right-wing quarters in the United States toward undermining agreements with the U.S.S.R., but sometimes prods Washington toward violating the provisions of the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty (SALT-2) and the Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM Treaty).

For instance, in keeping with Article 12 of the SALT-2 the sides pledged not to bypass the provisions of the treaty through any state or states or in any other way. This article is important inasmuch as it prohibits the parties to the treaty from achieving unilateral military advantages by transferring weapon systems that are limited by the treaty to its allies. In case the "ceiling" set by the SALT-2 treaty, say, on the ballistic missiles with multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRV) is surpassed any of the sides must dismantle and destroy the MIRV missiles it has in excess of the limit of 1,200 units allowed by the terms of the agreement. It is prohibited to transfer to the allies any arms that exist in excess of the limits instead of destroying them.

In March 1982 the Government of Britain announced its decision to fit out four of its submarines with the Trident-2 missiles system with U.S.-Manufactured MIRV's. Soon after that Washington said it was ready to sell the missiles to Britain on "soft terms", although such nuclear systems are subject to limitation under SALT-2. Britain, thus, helps Washington to circumvent the provisions of the treaty. The United States evidently thinks it has the "right" not to dismantle its arms as required by the international agreements and to hand to its allies the systems it has in excess of the limit. At the same time Washington is known to refuse even to take account of Britain's nuclear arms in the overall balance of forces of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty.

It is clear that such a practice constitutes a flagrant violation of not only article 12, but also the spirit and the letter of the SALT-2 treaty as a whole.

Not so long ago Washington managed to secure Britain's official consent to participate in the realization of its plans for developing a large-scale space-based anti-ballistic missile defense. Having signed a corresponding agreement with the United States, the British government has demonstrated its readiness to become Washington's accomplice in breaching the Soviet-U.S. Agreement on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile systems. This agrement, signed in 1972, prohibits the parties to it from transferring ABM systems or their components to other states or deploying them outside their territories.

According to press reports, Washington promised to provide its ally not only with technical information, but also with individual ABM components in exchange for the right to use British scientists and British territory in its preparations for "star wars". This is another instance of violation of an arms limitation treaty by the United States and Britain.

The record of the present British Administration in the sphere of arms limitation and reduction, its practical decisions on problems of war and peace enable the Thatcher government to claim the doubtful laurels of the most loyal follower of Washington's aggressive doctrines in Western Europe.

Alekseyer

OW110757 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 Gmt 10 Dec 85

[From the Novosti Newscast: commentary by Sergey Alekseyev]

[Text] The world's public assesses the Anglo-U.S. agreement on cooperation in realizing the Star Wars program as a new dangerous step on the road to escalating the arms race. Here is what our commentator has to say: [Alekseyev] Hello, comrades: Since President Reagan made his so-called Strategic Defense Initiative program public in the spring of 1983, UK Prime Minister Thatcher has become probably the most active supporter of this program among the NATO allies of the United States. Officially only doubts of the British Government as to the material benefits to the United Kingdom of participation in SDI hindered its decision to join the program. Now this obstacle has been removed. Judging by everything, the U.K. prime minister promised big profits to her financiers, industrialists, and scientists. As a matter of fact, the cost of implementing this program is estimated to be $26 billion.

U.S. Defense Secretary Weinberger also hastened to placate the British. At the document signing ceremony in London he declared -- and I cite: Soon Great Britain will receive considerable rewards, that now many British companies can expect profitable contracts with their U.S. partners. A British journalist, commenting on the ceremony, noted with some justification that it looked like a scene from school life. The pupil had pleased his master and now he was receiving pats on his back. Unfortunately, and primarily for the British people, similar scenes can be used to illustrate more than just the present crucial decision of London. The desire to be the first to demonstrate at any cost its support for the actions of official Washington regardless of how questionable they appear to be to the rest of the world, has practically become a distinctive feature of the British Conservative Government's foreign policy line. For example, look at this relations with the apartheid regime in the Republic of South Africa, the recent joint explosion of a nuclear device in the State of Nevada, and the decision to follow the United States in withdrawing from UNESCO. And now through the efforts of its leadership, the United Kingdom has become the first country in the world to officially agree to participate with the United States in the "star wars." This kind of obedience is dangerous, dangerous for Britain itself, and for the cause of peace in general.

Maslennikov

PM101435 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 10 Dec 85 First Edition p 5

[A. Maslennikov: "A New and Dangerous Step"]

[Text] The British Government has taken a new, extremely dangerous step along the path of stepping up the arms race. At a hastily convenedceremony in London, the U.S. and British defense ministers put their signatures to an Anglo-American agreement on cooperation in the development [razrabotka] of the research part of the "star wars" program.

The agreement (its specific contents are being kept secret) formulates the general rules by which British industrial companies, universities, and research institutes must be guided when concluding contracts with the American Administration on the so-called "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI). A special directorate is being set up in the British military department for the purpose of coordinating these contacts. The British Government is thereby officially placing the scientific establishments and industrial potential of its country at the service of American plans to militarize outer space.

Commenting on the situation in which the signing of the agreement took place, British political observers note that it was signed only several hours after the completion of the many months of negotiations between representatives of the two countries in Washington. This haste was caused by the Thatcher government's wish to please its senior partner at all costs and, at the same time, to "set an example" to the other U.S. allies in the NATO bloc. As yet they are in no hurry to enter into these militarist plans.

Commentators here note that, in signing the agreement, U.S. Secretary of Defense C. Weinberger refused to make any pledge with regard to placing at the disposal of the British side new scientific and technical discoveries which may be made in the course of implementing the aforementioned program. Speaking after the signing of the agreement, he said that the fulfillment of future contracts will be subject to U.S. legislation relating to the export of technology.

N. Kinnock, leader of the Labor Party, described the signed agreement as a "dangerous and destabilizing step" totally at variance with the spirit of Geneva. He recalled that, under U.S. pressure, the British Government had just announced its withdrawal from UNESCO.

Having taken a dangerous step in the direction of "star wars," the British Government has virtually acknowledged that its words on slackening the arms race and reducing nuclear arsenals in Europe do not correspond to its practical actions. And these actions are by no means in the interests of Europe, or of Britain itself.

ITALIAN PREMIER'S REAPPOINTMENT ASSESSED

PM051631 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4

[L. Kamynin "Notes Apropos": "Craxi Cabinet Course"]

[Text] The Italian Government headed by Socialist Party leader Bettino Craxi has established a kind of record: Created in August 1983, it has outscripped all cabinets in the country's postwar history in terms of time in office.

Of course, this has not come about without difficulty. One of the latest obstacles on the way to this record was the crisis played out as a result of the regrettably memorable events around the terrorist seizure of the ship the "Achille Lauro" in October. The steps taken by the then Italian head of government and foreign minister in the interests of national sovereignty, but going against the arbitrary actions of the United States, caused irritation in Washington, and hence followed the outright pressure which led to a serious government crisis in the Apennine peninsula.

However, the crisis was overcome and although sharp differences still remained between the parties represented in it, the coalition government continued to exist. The cabinet was nonetheless reformed, and a motion of confidence was discussed in parliament, where head of government B. Craxi delivered a speech.

He assured the deputies that the government's foreign policy course will continue to accord fully with the principles expounded in its program statement of 9 August 1983. Enumerating these principles in detail, Craxi stressed that "peace, security, and independence" are the "main ideals by which the government will be guided in its activity." The head of government noted that "Italy condemns the doctrine of military solutions." The Italian government, he said, has endeavored to do everything possible to "restore cooperation between East and West," and Italy's position is "still linked with the idea of an overall balance, capable of ensuring security for all."

Those, in brief, are the principles we are talking about. Without them it is hardly possible to imagine an independent and constructive foreign policy being pursed by a sovereign state in our day. And it is the implementation of these principles which can ensure Italy prestige in the international arena.

Italy's reaction today to the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting in Geneva is also inscribed in this course proclaimed by B. Craxi. The Italian president, the chairman of the Council of Ministers, leading politicians, and representatives of broad public circles in the country see it as an "undoubted success" and a "dialogue inspiring great hopes." In an interview given to the newspaper IL MESSAGGERO, B. CRAXI, touching on Italy's role in building bridges between West and East, said that: "We will continue to move in this direction in an atmosphere that has now changed and has undoubtedly become more favorable."

But, at the same time, it is impossible not to see something else too -- something that the Rome press calls differences on a national scale on a number of key problems of national and indeed international security. These include the deployment of U.S. medium-range nuclear missiles in Sicily, transforming the country into a hostage of the U.S. "hawks". But the not-completely-firm position of official Rome as regards the U.S. Strategic Defense Initiative gives rise to valid anxiety among Italians lest their country become involved in "star wars" under pressure from the "senior partner."

Yet all this is also a very important question of the country's independence and authority. Italy's general public increasingly and decisively favors detente in Europe and the nonmilitarization of space. And it is these, and not any other plans that meet the "ideals of peace, security, and independence" proclaimed as the foreign policy goal of B. Craxi's government.

DANISH FOLKETING RESOLUTION ON NUCLEAR STRIKE BAN

LD090826 Moscow TASS in English 0753 GMT 9 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 9 TASS -- The Danish Folketing (parliament) has passed a resolution urging the government to make a proposal in the United Nations for signing an international agreement to ban the first use of nuclear weapons.

"The peace-minded appeal," the newspaper PRAVDA said today, "reflects what is a popular sentiment in northern Europe today. Most of its inhabitants and many of its political parties and public organizations have long been pressing vigorously for lower international tension. The anti-war and anti-nuclear movement, which unites hundreds of thousands of people of most different political convictions, has been playing a particularly manifest role in these efforts of late. As far as Denmark is concerned, its parliament has been and remains clearly against medium-range nuclear missile deployments in Western Europe and against the militarization of outer space. The MPS have bound the government to act in various organizations and at the NATO forums precisely from this stand."

The majority of north Europeans, PRAVDA went on to say, demand proclaiming their region a nuclear-free zone. The idea is supported by practically all parties in the north. True, right-wing parties and organizations do this with reservations and, looking back at NATO, try to delay the practical resolution of the issue. Millions of Swedes, Finns, Norwegians and Danes, the paper said, are quite capable of discerning the root cause behind the present-day tension and they put forward their opinion in no uncertain terms, by campaigning against the arms race, against the covert or overt presence of nuclear weapons in the region and against the involvement of northern Europe into NATO's positions-of-strength, disarmament and detente. And this can only be hailed by the peace forces on the continent.

MASHINOEKSPORT EXHIBITION OPENS IN KUWAIT

LD072212 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1130 GMT 7 Dec 85

[From the "Novosti" newscast, presented by Oktavian Kornicho, A. Popov video report]

[Summary] The volume of trade between the USSR and Kuwait has considerably increased in the past few years.

A specialized exhibition of the Soviet foreign trade association, Mashinoeksport, has opened in an exhibition hall in the Kuwaiti capital. For a number of years the association has been supplying Kuwait and other Persian Gulf countries with drilling equipment, machines and storage capacities for oil and oil products.

As a result of successful talks during the visit to Kuwait by a Soviet delegation, a protocol providing for the further development of mutually advantageous trade between our countries was signed.

AKOPOV INTERVIEWED ON MIDDLE EAST TIES

LD091248 Kuwait KUNA in Arabic 0947 GMT 7 Dec 85

[Text] Kuwait, 7 Dec KUNA -- The Soviet ambassador to Kuwait, Pogos Akopov, confirmed in a press interview published today that his country's relations with Kuwait constitutes a good example of fruitful cooperation, and added that the USSR respects Kuwait's independent foreign policy and appreciates the positive role played by Kuwait at the Arab and international level and in the Nonaligned Movement. Concerning his country's relations with the Arab Gulf states, he told AL-ANBA' that diplomatic relations with Saudi Arabia were established in the twenties and with the United Arab Emirates in December 1971, immediately after the establishment of the state, on 13 November 1985 the exchange of diplomats took place at ambassadorial level. The ambassador went on to say that in September this year a meeting took place between the foreign ministers of Oman and the Soviet Union in New York on the basis of an exchange of messages between the leaders of the two countries, and that contacts were taking place concerning the implementation of the agreement on diplomatic representation. As regards Bahrain and Qatar, Akopov said that the USSR has relations with them "although there has not been recognition of their formalities, [no quotation mark as received] On relations with the Yemen Arab Republic, he said that they are ancient, firm and friendly, and there is also a treaty of friendship and cooperation based on cooperation in all fields, which serves the consolidation of Arab-Soviet friendship in general.

Concerning his view of Soviet-Egyptian relations, Akopov said: "It is known that there are no ambassadors in Cairo or Moscow at present to work for the consolidation and widening of our relations, and that there is nothing new in this relationship."

With regard to the Iraqi-Iranian war he said "this war is totally senseless and it is not in the interest of the Iraqi or the Iranian peoples equally. We have called continuously for the halting of this war and the settlement of the differences between the two sides by peaceful means, taking into consideration the national interests of both sides; this attitude we express to both sides during our contacts with them." He said that his country welcomes "all initiatives aimed at halting this war, whether those of the states of the region or those of Islamic organizations. The aggravation of this war harbors the real danger of its widening and internationalization."

On relations with the PLO, he said that his country's attitude remains unchanged and firm, recognizing the PLO as the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people. He said that before all else we support the maintenance of the unity of the PLO because unity is the basic essential factor in the struggle for the realization of the legitimate national rights of the Palestinian people. He added that this means "that the Israeli forces should withdraw from the occupied territories and the Palestinian problem should be solved on the basis of self-determination and the establishment of its national state, and guaranteeing the right of the states of this region to independence."

On the Soviet evaluation of conditions in the region, Akopov said "the road to a comprehensive and just settlement of the Middle East problem is through an international conference under the auspices of the United Nations and the participation of all the concerned parties, including the PLO." He expressed the belief "that the separate deals road and maneuvering can only lead to temporary settlement. This however underlines the need for a settlement which brings about the establishment of firm peace in the region, and therefore there is a need for collective efforts in the search for a truly realistic way of resolving this situation."

With regard to the USSR's attitude toward developments in Lebanon, Akopov said: We call for Lebanon's unity and the solution of all differences among the Lebanese factions and the various forces there by the Lebanese themselves without any foreign interference, and the safeguarding of the Lebanese Government's sovereignty over the entire Lebanese territory. We call for the withdrawal of Israel from all Lebanese territories and the nonpartitioning of Lebanon."

With regard to the USSR's relations with Syria, the Soviet ambassador affirmed that his country's relations with Syria "are strong and founded on common objectives, the struggle against the imperialist intrigues in the area and for the realization of the legitimate rights of the Arab peoples against the Israeli aggression."

With regard to the USSR's relations with Israel, he said that his country's stand is "a principled one. Secretary General Mikhail Gorbachev has declared that it would be possible to restore relations between the two sides, but only after the solution of the Middle East and its withdrawal from the Arab territories occupied during the 1967 war."

On his evaluation of the Afghan problem, Akopov said: "We stand by the solution of so-called Afghan problem on the basis of the proposals put forward in this regard by the legitimate government of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, which provide guarantees for ending this undeclared war against Afghanistan and the ending of foreign interference in the country's affairs, including military intervention."

He affirmed that the government of Afghanistan is prepared to enter into negotiations in this matter with all parties' concerned."

Asked for his views on the results of the recent meeting between Reagan and Gorbachev, Akopov said that he believes that the American-Soviet meeting was a historic one serving the cause of peace. He added that the aim of the USSR is clear: To seek the best means for understanding over the main issue -- the prevention of war. He affirmed that the meeting was a positive step toward clearing the atmosphere concerning the international situation. He said he hopes efforts toward this end will continue.

U.S. 'ANTI-LIBYA' CAMPAIGN CRITICIZED

LD091207 Moscow Tass in English 1152 GMT 9 Dec 85

[Text] Tripoli, December 9 -- The public of Libya voices deep worry over continued tension on the Libyan-Egyptian border and over the concentration of U.S. air and naval forces in close proximity of the Libyan shores. The news agency JANA reports that American warplanes are constantly making reconnaissance flights along the Libyan coast. Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, the leader of the Libyan revolution, who is currently on a tour of a number of African countries, told journalists that American fighters had opened fire at a Libyan plane on a regular training flight over the Mediterranean. Libyan, he stressed, will not be scared and is resolved to repulse the intrigues of the forces of U.S. imperialism.

Three frontier districts of Libya were put on alert in view of the concentration of Egyptian troops on the Libyan-Egyptian border. Army units have urgently been replenished with personnel and combat technology to bring them to full strength. At present tension in Libyan-Egyptian relations is subsiding. Egyptian president Husni Mubarak is quoted here as saying that Egypt has no aggressive intentions towards Libya. Yet it is reported that troops still remain on combat alert.

It is believed in the political community here that the present-day invigoration of the provocative actions of U.S. troops in the Mediterranean is being carried out under an overall anti-Libyan campaign unleashed by the United States, which is obviously displeased with an independent anti-imperialist policy pursued by Libya.

Telegrams from people's assemblies and revolutionary committees addressed to Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, leader of the Libyan revolution keep coming in. They voice support for the policy of the Libyan Jamahiriya. Mass demonstrations of protests have taken place in Libya during the past few days against attempts at imperialist intervention in the affairs of the country. Demonstrators carried anti-American posters denouncing the subversive actions of the U.S. Administration.

The progressive public of the Arab countries points out the need for an early normalisation of the situation around Libya and urges energetic efforts to prevent its further aggravation.

GORBACHEV CABLES DOS SANTOS ON REELECTION

LD102133 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2030 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has sent a telegram to Jose Eduardo dos Santos, chairman of the MPLA-LP [Popular Movement for the Liberation of Angola-Labor Party] and president of the People's Republic of Angola, cordially congratulating him upon his reelection to the post of high responsibility, that of Chairman of the MPLA-LP. The 2d MPLA-LP Congress, which has just ended, the telegram says, has demonstrated the resolve of the Angolan people to defend the gains of their revolution and go forward along the path of independence and social progress. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev wished all members of the MPLA-LP new successes on this path. The CPSU and the Soviet people will continue to unswervingly support Angola's just cause, the telegram says.

SHEVARDNADZE, LESOTHO'S MAKHELE SIGN ACCORD

LD101039 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0935 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, 10 Dec (TASS) -- A meeting took place today between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, and Vincent Montsi Makhele, secretary general of the Basotho National Party and foreign affairs minister of the Kingdom of Lesotho, who is in Moscow at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With Asian and African Countries. Questions of bilateral relations, together with some topical international problems of mutual interest, were discussed during the conversation which proceeded in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding.

On the same day, Eduard Shevardnadze and Vincent Montsi Makhele signed an agreement on cultural and scientific cooperation between the USSR and the Kingdom of Lesotho.

The agreement provides for the development of relations between the USSR and Lesotho in the fields of education, science, culture, art, the cinema, television, radio broadcasting and sports.

BRAZILIAN FOREIGN MINISTER CONTINUES MOSCOW VISIT

More on Shevardnadze Talks

LD101527 Moscow TASS in English 1510 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 10 TASS -- Talks were continued in the USSR Foreign Ministry today between the member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Eduard Shevardnadze and the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Federative Republic of Brazil Olavo Setubal. They exchanged views on problems connected with Soviet-Brazilian relations and prospects of their development. Both sides expressed satisfaction over the development of versatile ties between the USSR and Brazil and stressed the readiness to expand mutually advantageous cooperation in various spheres.

Upon the end of the talks Eduard Shevardnadze and Olavo Setubal signed a memorandum of mutual understanding about consultations on problems of mutual interest.

The sides also worked out jointly the text of the Soviet-Brazilian report for the press on the visit to the USSR of Olavo Setubal which will be made public.

Meets With Gromyko

LD122126 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Dec 85

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] In the Kremlin today, Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko received Olavo Setubal, minister of foreign affairs of the Federative Republic of Brazil, who is staying in our country on an official visit, and those persons accompanying him on the visit.

During the conversation, which was held in a constructive and businesslike atmosphere, there was a discussion of problems connected with strengthening peace in general and international security, and also questions of Soviet-Brazilian relations.

The Soviet side stressed the importance of using the favorable possibilities opened as a result of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's meeting with Ronald Reagan in Geneva to prevent an arms race in space and to stop it on earth. In this connection, both sides noted the fundamental significance of the understanding reached between the USSR and United States on the impermissibility of nuclear war.

Comrade Gromyko expressed satisfaction at the state and development of relations between the USSR and Brazil, and gave a high assessment of the strengthening and expanding practice of political contacts. A considerable contribution to the improvement of understanding between the peoples of the two countries is made by exchanges of parliamentary delegations. Confidence was expressed that Olavo Setubal's present visit will promote the strengthening and development of relations between the two countries in various areas, the expansion of their interaction in international affairs, in the interests of the Soviet and Brazilian peoples, and in the interests of peace in general. Olavo Setubal stressed that Brazil is in favor of consolidating peace and reducing international tension. He also favored expanding relations between Brazil and the USSR, which are of a friendly nature.

Andrey Andreyevich Gromyko conveyed, through Olavo Setubal to President Jose Sarney of Brazil, an invitation from the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium to visit the Soviet Union. The Brazilian minister of foreign affairs expressed gratitude for the invitation, and said he would tell the president about it.

Taking part in the conversation were Comrade Kuznetsov and other officials, and also Brazil's ambassador to the USSR, Sardenberg.

Setubal Press Conference

LD102016 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 10 TASS -- Soviet-Brazilian talks have been held in an atmosphere of mutual understanding. The two countries decided to further expand relations in the political, economic, scientific and technological spheres, to carry out bilateral meetings and contacts on various levels on a regular basis, Olavo Egidio Setubal, minister of foreign affairs of Brazil has stated. He spoke at a press conference here today.

Olavo Setubal pointed out the similarity of positions of both sides on a number of international problems. Brazil and the Soviet Union come out for taking urgent measures for the consolidation of peace and international security, for the removal of the war threat, he added.

Olavo Setubal said further that during the talks the sides had touched upon the results of the summit meeting in Geneva. He specially signaled out the passage of the Soviet-American statement which said that a victory in the nuclear war was not possible and that the sides would not seek to achieve military superiority. These provisions are a good precondition for ensuring peace and further efforts aimed at curbing the arms race and at disarmament, he stressed. Olavo Setubal underlined that Brazil was pursuing an independent foreign policy. Touching upon the situation in Central America, he said that his country favoured a peaceful settlement of regional conflicts and supported efforts in this direction exerted by the Contadora Group.

Olavo Setubal said that foreign debt was one of the main problems facing Latin American countries, including Brazil. He pointed out the need for combined actions with a view to settling the problem of foreign debt and stressed the importance in this respect of the meeting of the Cartagena Group which is to be held soon in the capital of Uruguay. He also drew the attention of the press conference to the fall in the prices of raw materials which inflicted great damage to the economies of Latin American countries. It resulted in the loss of about 65 billion dollars in first ten months of the current year alone. In conclusion Olavo Setubal told about his meeting with the President of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet Andrey Gromyko and pointed out that it had been held in a warm and cordial atmosphere.

Seen Off By Shevardnadze

LD110721 Moscow TASS in English 0710 GMT 11 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 11 TASS -- Olavo Egidio Setubal, minister of foreign affairs of the Federative Republic of Brazil, left the Soviet Union today. The guest was seen off by Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, minister of foreign affairs of the USSR, and by other Soviet officials. The Brazilian minister of foreign affairs has stayed in the USSR on an official visit at the invitation of the Soviet Government.

IZVESTIYA Report

PM110940 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading "Soviet-Brazilian Talks"]

[Text] Talks began 9 December between E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and O. Setubal, foreign minister of the Federative Republic of Brazil, who is on an official visit to the Soviet Union.

Topical international problems were discussed in a constructive spirit. It was ascertained that the Soviet Union and Brazil adhere to identical or close views on a number of key questions of international relations and advocate immediate measures to strengthen peace and international security and eliminate the threat of war.

During the meeting anxiety was expressed at the dangerous tension in the world and the continuing arms race. The ministers emphasized the need for peactical actions which would help to improve the international situation. In this connection, E.A. Shevardnadze drew the Brazilian minister's attention to the comprehensive proposals put forward by the Soviet Union aimed at preventing the militarization of space in conjunction with nuclear arms reductions. The achievement of specific accords on these questions would help to substantially diminish the nuclear threat, to strengthen peace, and to create an atmosphere of mutual trust between states.

The Soviet side noted that the meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the U.S. President in Geneva creates opportunities for a constructive quest for ways to normalize Soviet-U.S. relations and the situation in the world as a whole and to achieve a transition to real disarmament. It is important that the accords which have been reached should be implemented. For its part the Soviet Union is ready for this. Emphasis was also placed on the need to increase the efforts by all states for the prupose of preventing a nuclear war, strengthening universal peace, and curbing the arms race.

The sides expressed anxiety in connection with the existence of seats of tension in various parts of the world and advocated the achievement of settlement by peaceful means and on the basis of observance of the principle of noninterference in the internal affairs of states and total respect for the peoples' right to an independent path of development. The Soviet side drew particular attention to the dangerous situation in Central America, and particularly around Nicaragua. The Soviet Union's principled line in favor of peaceful political settlement in the region and in support of the constructive efforts being pursued in this direction was confirmed.

The same day E.A. Shevardnadze gave a luncheon in honor of O. Setubal during which they exchanged speeches. Our two countries' readiness to impart a regular nature to the bilateral political dialogue and take the path of strengthening relations in various spheres became manifest in the course of the talks, E.A. Shevardnadze noted. The Brazilian foreign minister's visit to the Soviet Union is the first in the history of our relations. It consolidates the existing practice of political contacts between the governments.

This year you and we marked the 40th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the Soviet Union and Brazil. We appreciate the fact that Brazil, together with the members of the anti-Hitler coalition, participated directly in combat operations against the forces of fascism.

During the time that has elapsed relations between our countries, based on the principles of noninterference, respect, and mutual advantage, have enjoyed appreciable development. But this is obviously not the limit.

In our view, given the vast economic and creative potential at our countries' disposal and their contribution to world affairs, considerable unexploited opportunities still exist for the further development and deepening of Soviet-Brazilian cooperation in various spheres.

Of course, we discussed primarily the questions of preventing nuclear war and terminating the arms race, which are of profound concern for everyone. It is clear to every sober-minded person that unless the extension of the arms race from the earth into space is blocked now, outer space will be loaded with strike weapons which are no less deadly than nuclear weapons.

The Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva was necessary and useful. We attach extreme importance to the mutual understanding that was reached to the effect that a nuclear war must never be unleashed and that there can be no victors in such a war, and also to the sides' recognition of the importance of preventing any war between them and to the stipulation that they will not strive to achieve military superiority. Fundamental importance is attached to the confirmation given at the meeting of the joint Soviet-U.S. accord on the subject and objectives of the talks on nuclear and space weapons. Now all peace-loving peoples must raise their voices against the threatening danger while there is still time and while the situation has not become irreversible.

We note with gratification the growth of the role played by Latin American states in international affairs. They were the first in the world to announce the creation of a nuclear-free zone in the continent and to sign a corresponding treaty. The Soviet Union, as a country which has acceded to this treaty, supports these aspirations of Latin American states and advocates that the zone's nuclear-free status be fully observed. We also support their desire to prevent the militarization of the south Atlantic and turn it into a zone of peace and cooperation.

It is impossible not to see the serious danger posed in today's world by conflicts in different parts of the globe. Anxiety in this connection is generated by the situation in Central America. We consider that the solution to this region's problems lies along the path of a political settlement without outside interference, with consideration for legitimate interests, and with total respect for the sovereignty of all countries in the region. We acclaim the efforts by all states aimed at ensuring that the conflict situation in this region is resolved by peaceful means ruling out pressure and intervention. The questions of establishing truly equal international economic relations and a new world economic order, including the question of indebtedness, must be the subject of broad international discussion.

E.A. Shevardnadze noted that the Soviet-Brazilian conversations are proceeding in a businesslike and constructive spirit. They confirm the desire of the Soviet Union and Brazil to expand the political dialogue, to strengthen bilateral relations, and to promote the strengthening of peace and the improvement of the international situation. We have every reason to express gratification with the positive mood of our conversations.

O. Setubal delivered a speech in response. Having expressed gratitude for the hospitality, he noted that ties between the peoples of Brazil and the USSR have a long history. Now, O. Setubal said, a process of democratization of political and social life is underway in Brazil. In the sphere of interstate relations Brazil's determination to adhere to the principles of the sovereign equality of peoples, self-determination, and noninterference, and its adherence to the cause of peace and disarmament are strengthening.

O. Setubal went on to note that the international community welcomed, with hope and relief, the joint statement of the Soviet Union and the United States on the results of the November summit meeting in Geneva. Brazil confirms its stance of condemnation of the arms race and expresses resolute support for talks which will lead to nuclear disarmament.

We welcomed with great interest and optimism the words spoken by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee in Geneva during his important press conference for the world media, to the effect that all states -- developed capitalist, socialist, and developing -- have socioeconomic and ecological problems which must be solved on the basis of cooperation.

Having remarked that his is the first visit to the Soviet Union by a Brazilian foreign minister, O. Setubal expressed the hope that the Moscow meetings and the bilateral decisions and acts to which they will lead will mark the completion of a stage in the development of Soviet-Brazilian relations and will simultaneously open new prospects for the future.

Trade and economic relations, based on the agreement on deliveries of Soviet machines and equipment to Brazil and of Brazilian commodities to the USSR, are today a definite reality. Broad potential exists for scientific and technical cooperation based on the relevant agreement.

Touching on the development of political contracts between the two countries, he mentioned in particular president J. Sarney's meeting in New York with the USSR foreign minister during the 40th UN General Assembly session, which took place in a spirit of cordiality and reaffirmed both countries' desire to increase dialogue at all levels in a spirit of mutual respect and trust.

We will officially consolidate, O. Setubal said, the machinery for consultations on topical international questions of interest to both sides by signing a memorandum of mutual understanding on this account We were unanimous in stressing the link between disarmament and socioeconomic development, which is an exceptionally important concept for the developing countries. We confirmed that, despite the difference in socioeconomic systems, Brazil and the USSR have a sphere of common approaches on whose basis we can expand our relations and give them greater diversity. I came to Moscow with a message of goodwill and with the intention to study the possibilities for mutually advantageous cooperation and thus to further our peoples' progress and the better mutual understanding between our countries.

The luncheon was attended on the Soviet side by G.I. Marchuk, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the state committee for science and technology, leaders of a number of ministries and departments, and other officials; and on the Brazilian side by the officials accompanying the minister and Brazilian Ambassador to the USSR R. Sardenberg. The luncheon took place in a friendly atmosphere.

G.I. Marchuk received O. Setubal 9 December. The sides discussed the prospects for scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and Brazil.

A meeting took place between Foreign Trade Minister B.I. Aristov and O. Setubal. Questions concerning the present state and development prospects of mutual trade and economic relations were discussed.

The ministers exchanged letters extending the time limit for the conclusion of contracts under the 24 March 1975 agreement for the delivery of machines and equipment from the USSR to Brazil and the delivery of Brazilian commodities to the USSR.

I.F. Katushev, chairman of the state committee for foreign economic relations, had a conversation with O. Setubal during which questions of the two countries' economic and technical cooperation were discussed. An agreement on economic and technical cooperation between the governments of the USSR and Brazil was signed.

O. Setubal attended the opening of an exhibition devoted to the expedition in Brazil headed by Russian explorer G.I. Langsdorf in the first half of the 19th century. The exhibition was opened by Academician S.L. Tikhvinskiy, secretary of the USSR Academy of Sciences history section and dean of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Diplomatic Academy.

O. Setubal laid a wreath at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall, 10 December.

Lomeyko Briefing

LD101811 Moscow TASS in English 1743 GMT 10 Dec 85

[Text] Moscow, December 10 TASS -- A concurrence or closeness of the stands of the Soviet Union and Brazil on a number of key international issues was placed on record during the talks held here between Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, USSR foreign minister, and Olavo Egidio Setubal, Brazil's foreign minister. A statement to this effect was made at a briefing in Moscow today by Vladmir Lomeyko, head of the Press Department of the USSR Foreign Ministry.

This is the first visit of the Brazilian minister to the Soviet Union, and we attach much significance to it, he added. In the course of the talks, Vladimir Lomeyko said, the sides expressed concern about the continuing arms race and pointed out the need for practical actions to improve the international situation. The Soviet side stressed the need for lessening the danger of a new war, putting an end to the race of arms, especially of nuclear ones and preventing their spreading into outer space.

Vladimir Lomeyko pointed out that the Soviet side had drawn special attention to the dangerous situation in Central America, especially around Nicaragua. The Soviet Union reaffirmed its principled policy of support for the constructive effort towards a just political settlement in that region.

Satisfaction was expressed with the development of bilateral ties between the Soviet Union and Brazil, the mutual desire to strengthen them further in various fields. In that connection both countries have displayed readiness to give the bilateral political dialogue a regular character, contribute, in particular, to broadening the practices of bilateral consultations on international issues. To this end Eduard Shevardnadze and Olavo Egidio Setubal signed a memorandum of mutual understanding on consultations on issues of mutual interest. An intergovernmental agreement has also been signed on economic and technological cooperation, the agreement on the supply of machinery and equipment from the USSR to Brazil and on the supply of Brazilian products to the USSR has been prolonged.

Setubal Interview

PM101551 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Dec 85 Morning Edition p 5

[Text] Brazilian Foreign Minister Olavo Egidio Setubal has given an interview to APN special correspondents A. Polonskiy and K. Khachaturov on the eve of his official visit to the USSR.

"Our main goals in regard to Brazil's foreign policy course," the minister said, "are the defense of the principles of noninterference in other countries' internal affairs and self-determination of the peoples, respect for national sovereignty and the UN Charter, and, naturally, a desire for lasting peace.

"Political and economic relations with the countries of Latin America are of priority importance in Brazil's foreign policy. The Brazilian Government has from the outset supported the Contadora Group as the main means for achieving a peaceful settlement in Central America," the minister continued. "It is with that end in view, for example, that Brazil, together with Argentina, Uruguay, and Peru, recently set up a group in support of the Contadora process.

Olavo Egidio Setubal noted that ties between Brazil and the USSR had traditionally been correct. The development of relations with the Soviet Union -- political, trade, economic, scientific, technical, and other relations -- is being carried out by us in light of the USSR's role in the modern world," he said. "My upcoming visit to the Soviet Union -- the first visit ever to your country by a Brazilian foreign minister -- will mark a stage along the path of broadening those relations."

Olavo Egidio Setubal stressed the exceptionally great importance of the recent meeting between CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev and U.S. President R. Reagan. "The meeting," he said, "is creating a more favorable world climate. No one, of course, could expect a single meeting between the USSR and U.S. leaders to resolve all the urgent exceptionally complex problems of the modern world. But that meeting demonstrated the possibility of achieving positive results on the basis of goodwill and the sides' equality. Brazil is interested in reducing confrontation between the two great powers, in cutting all states' arms stockpiles, in pursuing a policy of peaceful coexistence, and in strengthening peace on our planet.